LETTER

TO

Mr. Archdeacon ECHARD,

Upon Occasion of his

HISTORY

OF

ENGLAND:

WHEREIN

The true Principl[illegible] Defended;
The WHIGS and [illegible] Vindicated;
Several Persons of [illegible]d from Aspersions;

AND

A Number of Historical Mistakes Rectify'd.

By EDMUND CALAMY, *D.D.*

The Second Edition, Corrected.

LONDON,

Printed for JOHN CLARK, *at the* Bible *and* Crown *in the* Poultry, *near* Cheapside. 1718.

Price One Shilling.

The CONTENTS.

THE *Introduction.* p. 7
The Author not prejudic'd againſt Mr. Archdeacon. p. 8
Reaſons for drawing up this Letter by way of Animadverſion on his Hiſtory of England, p. 9
Some Touches on his firſt Volume, p. 11, *&c.*
An Entrance on his II *and* III *Volumes,* p. 13
His dedicating them to King GEORGE, p. 14
And afterwards reflecting on the Puritans *for their Zeal for His* MAJESTY'S *Grandmother, the Queen of* Bohemia, p. 15
And on ſeveral of His MAJESTY'S *near Relations,* p. 17
On his ſurprizing Omiſſions, p. 18
As to the Meeting of Divines in the Jeruſalem-*Chamber in* 1640, *or* 41, Ibid
And as to Captain Yarranton's *Account of the Sham-plots after the* Reſtoration *of King* Charles, p. 20
And as to the Conference between the Lords and Commons about the meaning of the Words Aſſent *and* Conſent, *in the* Act of Uniformity, Ibid
On his remarkable Redundancies: As his ſtory of Cromwell's *Contract with the Devil,* p. 21

And his bantering the Citizens, as to their fear of having the Thames *blown up,* p. 22
Mr. Archdeacon's *inconsistency with himself, in applauding the* Revolution, *and yet declaring the Unlawfulness of Resistance in any Case whatever,* Ibid
The Oxford Decree, p. 26
The weakness of Complaining, at what might be justify'd by the Principles advanc'd, p. 27
On the want of an open Retractation, when Principles were chang'd, to make way for the Revolution, p. 29, 30
Warnings of the common Danger, p. 31
The Revolution *not brought about upon* Church of England *Principles,* p. 32, 33
The different Conduct of English *and* Scotish *Bishops at that Time,* Ibid
The different Views of the Archdeacon *and the Author,* p. 35, 36
Mr. Archdeacon's *Account of the* Popish-plot, p. 37
His principal Authority upon which he questions the truth of it, p. 39, 40
Of Coleman's *Letters,* p. 41
And Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey's *Murder,* p. 42
Proof of the reality of the Plot, p. 43
Of the Rye-house *Conspiracy, and Bishop* Sprat's *History of it,* p. 45, 48
Of Mr. Archdeacon's *being at once injurious both to Bishop* Sprat, *and my Lord* Russel, p. 49
His Account of the Death of the Earl of Essex *consider'd,* Ibid

Mr.

Mr. Archdeacon *less frank than my Lord* Clarendon, p. 51
Mr. Archdeacon, *no Enemy to the Grievances of the reign of King* Charles II, p. 52
An Abettor of Arbitrary Power, p. 54
A groundless Inveigher against the Whigs *for refusing* Expedients *offer'd in the room of the* Bill of Exclusion, p. 55
Mr. Archdeacon's *profess'd* Impartiality *consider'd*, p. 56
His Tenderness to the Papists, Ibid
His contrary Temper towards Protestant Dissenters, p. 59
His Reflections on the Disputants at the Savoy *Conference consider'd*, p. 59, 60
His Reflections on the Dissenters *in* 1662, p. 61
And in 1665, *upon occasion of the* Five Mile Act, p. 63
And in 1669, *when they were treated with about a* Comprehension, p. 64, 65
Upon their full Meetings, p. 66
Upon their Carriage after the Dissolution of the Long-Parliament, Ibid
Upon the Death of King Charles, p. 68
And upon their Conduct in the reign of King James, p. 69, *&c.*
Mr. Archdeacon's *Freedom with the Characters of several Persons of Figure and Reputation*: p. 72
Of the Scottish *Nation*, Ibid
And among the English, p. 73

His Reflections on the Family of John Hampden, Esq; p. 73, &c.
And on my Lord Russel. p. 76
And on my Lord Chief Justice Treby. p. 79
And on Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey. p. 80
His Reflections on the Westm. Assembly, p. 82, 83
His good Characters of several Members of that Assembly. p. 84
His ill Character of Mr. Edmund Calamy, p. 86
And of Mr. Stephen Marshall, p. 88
And of Dr. Cornelius Burgess, p. 90
His Reflections on some of the Ministers that were ejected in 1662. p. 93
Particularly on Mr. Baxter, p. 94
And on Dr. Manton. p. 95
Mr. Archdeacon's Reflections on the Author of the Abridgment. p. 97
About his Account of Dr. Spurstow. Ibid
And about the obligation he asserted parish Ministers to be under, to administer the Sacrament to persons unfit, p. 98
Mr. Archdeacon's peculiar way of citing Authors. p. 99
The Conclusion. Ibid

Mr.

Mr. Archdeacon,

I HAVE read over your three Volumes of *the Hiſtory of England*, which I can eaſily believe coſt you a great deal of pains; and have made ſome Obſervations upon them, which I addreſs to yourſelf, to make what uſe of them you pleaſe, except it be that of repreſenting me as *a diſcourager of uſeful and laudable deſigns*; which is a character that as I am not conſcious to myſelf I deſerve, ſo I am not fond of bearing it to poſterity. Pref. to Vol. II.

I am naturally a great lover of hiſtory, and particularly of the hiſtory of my own country, as well as of the government of it, which I take to be the beſt in the world: And therefore it is no ſmall pleaſure to me to obſerve, how divine providence has interpoſed from one period to another, to keep it upon its proper baſis, when there have been ſo many things that have endanger'd it, and ſo many deſigns form'd to alter and overthrow it.

It has long been complain'd, That we wanted an hiſtory, that ſhould with an even thread continue the account of ages paſs'd down to our own times.

I was in hope, that you, Sir, having ſo agreeable an hiſtorical genius, would by ingaging in ſuch a deſign and undertaking, have bid fair for giving general ſatisfaction; But am ſorry both upon your own account, and that of the publick, to find it ſo much otherwiſe.

I can ſafely ſay, That when I took your work into my hands, I was rather prejudic'd for, than againſt you. I was as ſenſible of

Pref. to Vol. I. "the great Benefit and general Uſefulneſs "of the *Engliſh* hiſtory to all the nobility, "and gentry, and a great number of others "in the nation," as moſt men. I look'd upon you as well qualify'd to draw up ſuch a work, and apprehended diligence and care would not be wanting on your part. I did not indeed expect a *compleat hiſtorian*, according to the ſtrict Rules of *Rapin* and *Le Moyne*. I am one that take a perfect performance either in hiſtory or any thing elſe to be a meer chimæra. A work *abſolutely free from errors*, was what I was not ſo weak as to look for. I reckon that the beſt hiſtory that is freeſt from faults. And when I became your reader, I was ready to make all the *candid allowances* you could deſire. According to your own motion, I

Pref. to Vol. II. *peruſed your work in order as it was written; and not by leaps, and ſtarts, and diſtant parcels.* And now I have gone through the whole, am ſo little inclin'd to detract from you, that I can freely ſay a great deal in your commendation. The clearneſs of your method, and the perſpicuity of your language,

language, are two very great excellencies, which I admire. I am ſingularly pleas'd with the *refreſhing diviſions* of your *matter*, and the *chronological diſtinction of the ſeveral parts of your hiſtory*. I neither make any objections againſt *the Form of it as irregular or diſproportionate, nor the general method as intricate and confus'd, nor the colouring as weak and unaffecting, nor the ſtile as mean, flat, and inſipid*, which are the things about which you appear peculiarly concern'd: And yet I thought a *publick Animadverſion* both proper and neceſſary, and can meet with none of your readers, how different ſoever in their ſentiments, views and principles, but what herein agree. Ibid.

I readily grant, 'twould be unjuſt to charge you either with the tediouſneſs and voluminouſneſs of *Hollingſhed* and *Speed*, or with the brevity and confinedneſs of *Milton* and *Daniel*. I own your hiſtory to have ſeveral beauties above many that have gone before you. But this conſideration, inſtead of diſcouraging the making Remarks, rather renders it the more needful. The reputation you have gotten by your former performances, and particularly your *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, which Dean *Prideaux* commends as *the beſt of its kind in the Engliſh tongue*; together with the ſmooth and polite way in which your preſent hiſtory is written; the great name of his Majeſty King GEORGE prefixed to your two laſt volumes, and your preſenting him with the whole, and receiving ſuch a reward from his royal bounty, (notice of which has been given in all parts by our publick news-papers) are ſuch advantages in order to a general reception, that apprehending ill im- Connexion of *Old* and *New Teſt.* Vol. III. p. 658.

preſſions might be made by your miſrepreſentations both of perſons and things, I thought there was reaſon to fear, that if no notice was taken of them, they would ſeem to have a ſort of publick ſanction, and be propagated to poſterity with a ſhew of Authority.

You know very well, Sir, that Animadverſions upon hiſtorical as well as other works, have not been uncommon among us. The *Examen Hiſtoricum* of Dr. *Heylin*, which is made up of Remarks on Dr. *Fuller*, and Mr. *Sanderſon*; and the *Specimen of the Errors and Defects of the Hiſtory of the Reformation*, publiſh'd by Mr. *Wharton* (under the diſguis'd name of *Harmer*,) together with Biſhop *Burnet*'s Reflections on the Hiſtory of Mr. *Varillas*, are very noted inſtances of this kind: But there is ſuch an acrimony in each of thoſe Writers, and ſuch a contempt of the Authors they were dealing with runs through all their Remarks; and I take that to be a method that ſo little contributes either to the conviction of ſuch as fall into miſtakes, or the ſatisfaction of any ingenuous readers, that inſtead of affecting, I ſhall ſtudiouſly avoid an imitation of them: And ſhall make my Remarks with the frankneſs of a friend, rather than the tartneſs of an adverſary.

And I am the more encourag'd to hope you'll herein bear with me, becauſe you have not only given my name a place pretty frequently in your margin among the authors you refer to, but have alſo interſpers'd ſeveral reflections upon what I had publiſh'd, tho' taken moſtly out of *the Compleat Hiſtory of England*, without much notice of the Returns I had made. However I hardly think I ſhould

upon

upon this account have given you any trouble, had I not met with things of much greater conſequence in the courſe of your hiſtory, which I tho't ought not to remain unanimadverted on, for the ſake of thoſe that are to come after us. And therefore tho' I ſhall not wholly overlook what ſeems particularly pointed at myſelf, yet I ſhall reſerve it to the cloſe of my Letter, where it will take up but very little room.

I can ſay as you, "That it was with "the advice, and at the inſtance of ſeveral "conſiderable friends and others," that I ſet myſelf to make theſe Remarks: And I have been not a little *adviſ'd and urged* to communicate my obſervations, on a work that does not ſeem barely deſign'd to amuſe, or to turn the penny, but is an account of paſt tranſactions, drawn up by a dignify'd clergy-man, to ſatisfy the preſent and future ages, as to the moſt conſiderable facts and their conſequences, as far as they are yet diſcover'd. And I muſt own I was herein a little encourag'd as well as you, by my having ſome advantages that I thought were not common to all. Pref. to Vol. II.

HAD Biſhop *Burnet*'s hiſtory, that is as yet kept ſecret, been publiſh'd to the world, I believe both you and I might have been clearer as to ſome things that are yet in the dark: But till that comes out, we muſt make the beſt uſe we can of what light we have.

I have little to ſay to your firſt volume, which I confeſs I reckon much the beſt of the three: And yet even there, there are ſome things that I think deſerve your ſecond thoughts. In your account of the reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, you moſt certainly bear too

Vol. I. p. 803. hard on that learned man Mr. *Cartwright*, in repreſenting his oppoſition to the eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, as ariſing meerly from a perſonal pique: And I am inclin'd to believe you might be convinc'd of it, if you'd take the pains to conſult Mr. *Peirce*. You are too ſevere upon the *Puritans*, who when you have found all the faults with 'em you can, were generally men of great piety, and true to the intereſt of their country, and therefore favour'd by our greateſt patriots, tho' run down by zealous eccleſiaſticks, who thought allowing others to differ from 'em tended to their own diminution.

Vindicat. of the Diſſenters Part I. p. 71, &c.

Vol. I. p. 911, &c. In the reign of King *James* I, your repreſentation of the conference at *Hampton-Court*, is very defective. I ſhould have thought it had not been amiſs for you to have taken notice of the account of that conference given by *Calderwood* in his *Hiſtory of the Church of Scotland*, which is ſo different from that publiſh'd here in *England* by Biſhop *Barlow*; and has been ſo oft referr'd to, as more faithful, and more particular.

Pag. 474, &c.

When you come to the proclamation which that King publiſh'd for *Uniformity* after this celebrated conference was over, you tell us, "It became a doubtful queſtion amongſt "many, Whether the Jeſuits or the Nonconformiſts, were greateſt enemies to the "*Church of England?*" Was this *a doubt amongſt many* at that time of day? reconcile this if you can to the temper and proceedings of the parliaments in that reign. In the next reign I'll grant it was ſo, amongſt too many: And it is too evident what lamentable conſequences follow'd upon it. But I hope this is no doubt with you, Sir; I won't allow

Ibid. p. 913.

allow myſelf to charge it upon you unleſs you own'd it, tho' I could have wiſh'd you had freely diſclaim'd it. If you are in any heſitation about the matter, give me leave to tell you a paſſage I had not long ſince, from a reverend aged clergyman of your own Church, yet living. Being in company where one ſignify'd it as his apprehenſion, that the *Papiſts* were not ſo much to be dreaded as the *Presbyterians*; this worthy perſon reply'd, he muſt beg leave to differ from him: For, ſaid he, the latter aim but at taking my *Surplice* from me, whereas the former would have my *Bible*; which I ſhould be much more loth to part with. I would hope that you are herein of the ſame mind with him.

And when you add, "That at the beginning of K. *James*'s reign, of the ten thouſand Miniſters in *England*, not above forty-nine ſtood out, and were depriv'd;" you fall too ſhort in your number: For *Calderwood*, whoſe authority I know no reaſon to call in queſtion tells us, "That in the "ſecond year after the King came into *Eng-land*, 300 miniſters were either ſilenc'd, or "depriv'd of their Benefices, or excommu-"nicated, or caſt into priſon, or forc'd to "leave their own country." *Vide* Præfat. ad *Alt. Damaſcenum.*

But I'll diſmiſs your firſt volume, of which I believe you'll hear more hereafter, from one that is taking no ſmall pains, in order to the ſetting the *Hiſtory of Nonconformity* in its firſt riſe and original in a clearer light than ever it has appear'd in yet; and ſhall proceed to your ſecond and third volumes which I am the moſt concern'd at; and which I think, as much need reviſing, as any thing that has yet come from the preſs in the reign of King

King GEORGE, either with his name or without.

AND now I have mention'd ſo great a name, I can't forbear taking notice how unhappy it is for you to have two ſo different patrons, to the different parts of your work. I find it ſtartles not a few of your readers, to ſee the name of the Duke of *Ormond* in the front of your firſt volume, and the auguſt name of King GEORGE prefix'd to the two laſt. All that I gather from thence, is that it was more lately that you ask'd or obtain'd his MAJESTY's leave, and did not know that ever you ſhould do it, when you made uſe of the name of the Duke of *Ormond*; who bore ſo different a character when you fix'd on him for your patron, from what he does now. But ſome will have it, that it is to the latter dedication, that the fine things you ſay concerning the *Revolution* are entirely owing. You tell us indeed, as to your *Introduction* to your ſecond volume,

Pref. to Vol. II. p. 7. "That tho' it has been written eleven years, "during which time there have been ſeve- "ral material changes in the government and "miniſtry, to which a deſigning man might "have been tempted to caſt a ſquinting eye; "yet you have not alter'd a ſingle paſſage "upon the account of the times, for the "ſake of parties, or with reſpect to any par- "ticular perſon." And yet ſome that pre- tend to know you, are of opinion, you are not ſo intirely free from *views* and *expectations*, as to have declar'd ſo openly for the

Pref. to Vol. III. *Revolution*, which you frankly own, "is ſaid "to have innumerable inconveniencies at- "tending it," without ſome regard to your ſecond patron, whoſe advancement to the

Britiſh

Britiſh throne, and conſequent capacity of diſpoſing of eccleſiaſtical preferments is wholly bottom'd upon it, and owing to it.

HOWEVER, his MAJESTY having allowed you (I enquire not upon whoſe motion) the honour to uſe his name, and condeſcended ſo far as to become your ſecond patron, and you having profeſs'd ſo much zeal for him in your dedication, I ſhould have thought the utmoſt caution had been afterwards needful, in every thing that might be likely to touch him in perſon, or any that belong'd to him: And after this, a reflection on any for their warm affection to the Family of his royal Grandmother, the Queen of *Bohemia*, carries in it ſo manifeſt an indecency, that I could hardly have imagin'd Mr. *Archdeacon* could have been guilty of it.

WE that are the poſterity of the honeſt *Puritans*, reckon it their honour and ours joyntly, that they and we, from firſt to laſt, have been as much diſtinguiſh'd by our affection to that Branch of the Royal Family, as they themſelves have been by their ſteady adherence to the intereſt of the Reformation, and the cauſe of liberty: And ſuppoſe this affection may not at all times have been free from mixtures of imprudence, we yet reckon the hearty friends of the illuſtrious Houſe of *Hanover*, ſhould eaſily excuſe us, without diſcovering any thing like a pleaſure, in making things of this kind matters of accuſation. Now it ſeems by you it ſo happen'd, that when there formerly was great rejoycing in the court of King *Charles* I, upon the pregnancy of his Queen, a leading man among the *Puritans*, was heard to ſay, "That he could ſee no

Vol. II. p. 7.

"ſuch

" ſuch cauſe of joy; for which he gave " this reaſon: That GOD had already pro- " vided better for 'em, in giving ſuch an " hopeful progeny to the Queen of *Bohemia*, " brought up in the reform'd religion; " while it was uncertain what religion that " King's children would follow, who were " to be brought up by a mother devoted to " the *Church of Rome.*" Suppoſe this expreſ- ſion of zeal was a little ill timed, yet when the event has ſo fully prov'd the wiſdom and juſtneſs of the remark, and the nation has ſince ſuffer'd ſo much from that King's children, and our honour has been ſo expos'd by their management, that the deſcendents of that good Queen are like to find it very diffi- cult to retrieve it; the reflection you have added upon this occaſion, might I ſhould think very well have been ſpar'd, by one that inſcrib'd his book to King GEORGE, who is the firſt of her family that wears our crown. And when you yourſelf own, that that excellent Queen was ſo different from her two Nephews, that while nothing would ſatisfy them but matching with *Papiſts*, (tho' nothing could be more againſt their intereſt) ſhe upon a talk of her ſon's being bred in the court of the Emperor, in order to the mar- rying his daughter, freely declar'd, " That Ibid. " ſhe had rather be his executioner, than " ſuffer her child to be bred up in idolatry: " I cannot ſee any reaſon for your *wondring*, that ſuch warmth and ſteadineſs as this, (which has not been very common in courts) ſhould cauſe her to be very dear to that party in *England*, that reckon'd their religion and liberty their chiefeſt intereſts. I move there- fore, good Sir, for your own ſake, that your

your reflections here, may for the future be forborn.

IT muſt be own'd, you ſpeak very honourably of that renowned Queen, and give her a great character, which ſhe well deſerved: But I can't think it very decent for you, (conſidering whoſe name you have in your front) to ſay of the old Prince *Palatine* her husband, who was no other than his Majeſty King GEORGE's unfortunate grandfather, "that he had nothing great in his cha-"racter." It might here have been conſider'd, how hard a thing it is to keep the ſpirit from ſinking, when a man is abandon'd by thoſe whoſe intereſt and honour it is to ſupport him; which was his unhappy caſe, through the prevalency of *Spaniſh* counſels at that time in our court. Vol. III. p. 70. Vol. II. p. 100.

NOR is it in my apprehenſion very courtlike, to ſpeak with ſo much contempt as you have done of the young Prince *Palatine*, that unhappy Prince's eldeſt ſon, and King GEORGE's eldeſt uncle. He did indeed, "joyn "with the parliament. But how do you know what reaſons he had for doing ſo? Perhaps he had ground to hope for aſſiſtance from them in recovering his dominions, which he had little reaſon to expect from his uncle *Charles*. And if ſo, 'tis hard to blame him. And if "the two Princes *Rupert* and "*Maurice* receiv'd him with ſcorn, when "(as you expreſs it) he thruſt a viſit upon "them, before their going beyond the "ſeas, for which they had paſſes granted "them:" I am far from thinking they were on this account to be commended: For ſtill he was their elder brother, which gave him ſuch a title to reſpect from them; that the ve- Vol. II. p. 555.

ry mentioning their failure in it, is a great reflection upon them. If I may be allow'd to adviſe you, I would drop ſuch things as theſe, or at leaſt alter them in any future impreſſion: For it has but an odd aſpect to take ſuch freedom with his MAJESTY's near relations, when his great name appears in ſuch ſplendour at the head of your hiſtory.

ANOTHER obſervation I make on your performance, is, That tho' you have ſeveral things new and entertaining, for which I thank you, yet are there ſome omiſſions not eaſily to be excus'd. And when you take the liberty to charge the great Lord *Clarendon* himſelf, to whom you are ſo much indebted both for matter and ſtile too, with *unaccountable omiſſions*, you can't, I ſuppoſe, think much of the ſame cenſure upon yourſelf, if there be occaſion for it.

Pref. to Vol. II. p. 5.

YOU are large enough in your account of the confuſions in church and ſtate, both before and all along the civil war; and yet I can't perceive you take any notice of the meeting in the *Jeruſalem-Chamber*, in the latter end of 1640, ſome call it 1641, of a ſub-committee of divines, who were to draw up propoſals in order to a peaceable ſettlement of eccleſiaſtical matters, about which there were then ſuch warm debates. Your ſilence as to this is the more inexcuſable, becauſe "this meeting in the opinion of ſome, might "under GOD, have been a means not only "to have check'd, but choak'd the civil war "in its infancy." The author cited in the margin, is far from being ſingular in that ſentiment. I am well ſatisfy'd that my worthy grandfather, who was one of 'em, (from whom I count it an honour to be deſcended,

Fuller's Ch. Hiſt. Book XI. pag. 174. 175.

not-

notwithſtanding you are pleas'd to ſtile him an *incendiary*) was in this of the ſame opinion. Mr. *Collier* ſays, " That the greateſt " part of this company being *Calviniſts* either in doctrine or diſcipline, 'tis no wonder to find them remonſtrate againſt the " management of church matters." But the deſign of their meeting was not ſo much remonſtrating, as making peace. The perſons that were ſummon'd upon this occaſion by Archbiſhop *Williams*, and met upon his ſummons, were Archbiſhop *Uſher*, Dr. *Morton* Biſhop of *Durham*, Dr. *Hall* Bp. *of Exeter*, Dr. *Ward*, Dr. *Brownrigg*, Dr. *Prideaux*, Dr *Holdſworth*, Dr. *Twiſſe*, Dr. *Hacket*, Dr. *Sanderſon*, Dr. *Burges*, Dr. *Featlye*, Mr. *White*, Mr. *Marſhall*, Mr. *Hill* and Mr. *Edmund Calamy*. Perhaps more likely perſons to anſwer the end intended could not have been brought together. And I have ſome reaſon to believe, that if they had been ſuffer'd to proceed, they would have fix'd upon ſome ſuch ſettlement as that which was afterwards propos'd in that declaration of King *Charles* II, which you yourſelf ſpeak ſo well of; and (after the compiler of the third volume of the *Compleat Hiſtory of England*) repreſent as " an " excellent pattern for poſterity, when they " are beſt diſpos'd to conſider of the moſt " proper and healing methods, either for the " reſtoring of the diſcipline, or the making " up the breaches of the eſtabliſh'd church." The beſt account that I know of, of the proceedings of this ſub-committee, is to be met with in Dr. *Fuller*, and in Mr. *Baxter*. Now for Mr. *Archdeacon* to publiſh a large *Hiſtory of England*, and take no notice of this matter, is not eaſily to be accounted for.

Eccl. hiſt. of Great Brittain. Book IX. pag 799.

Vol III. p. 31.

See his Life in Folio, p. 369. and Bp. Williams's Life.

Vol. III. pag. 66.

AFTER the *Reſtoration*, before things were fully fix'd, you mention a great noiſe of *plots*, and ſay, " That the *Presbyterian* defenders " alledge, that theſe were only ſham-plots to " help forwards the ſevere act of *Uniformity* " then in embryo; but others (you ſay) be- " lieve the contrary:" And then with all the calmneſs of a perſon wholly unconcern- ed, you add, That " we cannot fully de- " termine a matter that at this time wants " ſo much light." Here is another omiſ- ſion which is hardly to be excus'd: Becauſe you quite overlook what might have help- ed you *fully to determine*, by giving you all the *light* that could be ſaid to be *wanted*; I mean the Narrative of Captain *Yarranton*, which is very diſtinct and particular, and has been often referr'd to as deciſive in the caſe, and giving ſuch proof that thoſe *plots* were forg'd intrigues to ſerve a turn, as is equivalent to demonſtration. One that was willing to ſet things in a true light in a matter of ſo great moment, ſhould have taken ſome notice methinks, of a pamphlet that has been ſo frequent- ly cited as giving a full and ſatisfactory evidence.

Pref. to Vol. III. p. 2.

NOR can I ſee how it is to be excus'd, that when you ſo frankly own that you had the ſight of the Journals of the Lords and Commons in the two laſt reigns of which you write, you ſhould not have ſo much as a ſingle word of that explication of the *Aſ- ſent* and *Conſent*, mention'd in the *Act of Uni- formity*, that was given by the Lords, and re- fus'd by the Commons, in a Conference be- tween the two Houſes, ſoon after the paſſing

of

of that Act. Sure I am, you have given us from thence things of much leſs conſequence to clergymen; and therefore you muſt allow me a little to wonder that this ſhould be altogether overlook'd.

YOUR redundancies alſo ſeem as remarkable as your omiſſions. Thus you tell us a long and very incredible ſtory about *Cromwell*'s conference and contract with the Devil on the very morning of the memorable day of the fight at *Worceſter*: And yet you own, the account you give is more *wonderful* than *probable*. For my part I can't perceive that it is at all to be *wonder'd* at, that ſuch as are hot and indiſcreet ſhould raiſe and ſpread ſtories that have not the leaſt *probability* in 'em, of thoſe whom they are ſet againſt. But why an author that values his reputation and the credit of his hiſtory, ſhould tell a ſtory that he owns to have no *probability* in it, and reckon that it will give his reader *diverſion*, when there is no likelihood of its giving him any ſatisfaction, I cannot imagine. I think verily you might as well have given us an account of Dr. *Fauſtus*, or the *Lancaſhire witches*. But to tell ſuch a ſtory, and then leave the *credibility* of it to your *readers faith and judgment*, looks ſo like an inſulting him, that I believe few will think it either contributes to the *inriching* or *enlightning your work*, about which you ſometimes appear ſo much concern'd.— But whoever compares your account of this matter, with your relation of *Oliver*'s Death afterwards, would imagine, whatever your readers may do, you yourſelf believ'd it, and that very firmly too.

Vol. II. pag. 712, 713.

Ibid. p. 825.

I am one that can without much difficulty make allowance for the ebullitions of zeal, which

which often incline men to uſe very ſtrong figures; and yet muſt own you ſometimes ſeem to run too far; and to be too ſevere in your ſarcaſms and invectives: Thus methinks you bear a little too hard upon my native City of *London*, when you repreſent the Citizens as frighten'd out of their wits by a notion, " that there were deep deſigns by gun-
Vol. II. p. 288. " powder to blow up the *Thames*, and choak " them with the water in their beds." Its a ſign your opinion of the citizens runs very low, for which they are not much oblig'd to you. This is ſuch a rodomontade, that I know not how to reckon it any great ornament of your hiſtory. I think ſo much reſpect is owing from every author to his readers, as not to impoſe any thing upon them, which has not at leaſt the appearance of Truth, which I am of opinion moſt men will think this has not.

But to come to that which I take to be more conſiderable; you don't ſeem to me to be ſo conſiſtent with yourſelf, and the ſcheme you are moſt fond of, or ſo free in owning your quitting of it upon better light, as I ſhould expect from a judicious hiſtorian. In the dedication of your ſecond volume, and preface to the third, you applaud the *Revolution*: And in the hiſtory that follows, you as zealouſly applaud the principles that would have effectually prevented it; and do what in you lies to explode the principles upon which it was bottom'd. This to me looks like a man's appearing to be tranſported upon the recovery of one whoſe caſe appear'd deſperate, and extolling the healthful ſtate he is reſtor'd to, whilſt yet he takes pleaſure in inveighing againſt the medicines, to which his

his recovery was owing. You ſtile that in 1688, "A great and happy *Revolution*, (and "ſay) that it infus'd life and ſpirit into three "expiring kingdoms:" In which I moſt heartily agree with you. And yet you frequently declare againſt that *reſiſtance*, without which it could never have been brought about; and appear pleas'd in the laſt degree with the latter part of the reign of King *Charles* II, which was one continu'd invaſion upon the rights of the people, and brought us into that expiring ſtate, from whence nothing but a miracle of mercy could recover us. The two reigns of which your third volume gives us the hiſtory, were indeed cloſely connected together, and naturally follow'd each other. The one laid the foundation, and the other rais'd the ſuperſtructure. But as he that puts a ſword into a madman's hand, muſt bear the blame of the miſchief he does with it; ſo, as far as I can perceive, muſt they that were ſo very zealous firſt for freeing King *Charles* from all reſtraints, and then for ſecuring the reverſion of the crown to his brother *James*, take it upon themſelves, that we were ſo much expos'd, when King *James* that came after him, took the liberty to go beyond all Bounds.

Dedicat. to King *George* p. 1.

For your part, you would not by any means have King *Charles* be under any reſtraint; you are ſo profoundly loyal, you abhor the thoughts of it. You appear greatly pleas'd with the *Corporation Act*, which obliges all corporation officers to make oath, *that it was not lawful* upon any pretence whatſoever, *to take Arms againſt the King*, &c. This you rejoyce in, as *a ſevere mortification and blow to a party*, whom you take all opportunities

Vol. III. p. 69.

tunities to run down; and reckon it a mighty happineſs, tho' it threw many of the beſt members out of all the corporations of *England*, by a pretended regulation. When you afterwards mention the oath again, upon occaſion of the *Militia Act*, which oblig'd all military officets to take it, your heart ſeems to miſgive you, and you diſcover a ſort of fear

Ib. p. 80. " of giving up the whole conſtitution, and " encouraging a doctrine hard to be recon- " concil'd to our great delivernce." But this qualm is ſoon over: For when you come to the *Uniformity Act*, which requir'd of all clergymen a ſubſcrib'd declaration, in the very words of the oath that had been impos'd by

Ib. p. 81. the acts foregoing, you repreſent it " as " an expedient awe and reſtraint, fix'd by " the wiſdom of the nation." And when an oath to the ſame purpoſe, was by the *Oxford Act* requir'd of the Diſſenting Miniſters upon pain of being baniſh'd five miles from all corporations, you intimate, that the Parliament did it for *Self-preſervation.*

Ib. p. 150. And when in 1675, there was an attempt on foot in the Houſe of Lords, to make this oath general, and in effect univerſal, by extending to all in any office civil or eccleſiaſtical, and to Privy-counſellors and members of Parliament, in which caſe there was as great a ſtruggle as ever was known in the Houſe, the debates laſting for ſixteen or ſeventeen whole days, you tell us of a cer-

Ib. p 379. tain, " warm author, who ſaid, (and I think with a great deal of ſenſe and truth,) " that " this would have been a diſſettlement of " the whole birth-right of *England*:" But it does not appear you were in any fear about the matter. You bring this in, in ſuch a way,

way, as intimates that you were of another mind. *Reſiſtance in any caſe whatſoever*, is what you are ſo much againſt, that you vindicate the letter of Dr. *Tillotſon* upon that ſubject, to the Lord *Ruſſel*, on the very day before his execution; " which letter, (you " ſay) fully gives the reaſons and grounds " for paſſive-obedience:" Tho' others are of opinion, that this letter was ſuch a blemiſh to that excellent perſon, as could never be wip'd off, but by an open retractation. And I could name to you a perſon of ſome eminence, (and one whom you yourſelf mention in your hiſtory with honour) who tho' he before had a great reſpect for that Doctor, yet upon account of that letter, which was never publickly retracted, was not to be prevail'd with to enter into any free converſation with him to his dying day. Ib. p. 692.

While others were grieving and lamenting, as dreading the conſequence, you rejoyce, as one carrying your point: And tell us, " That the ill ſucceſs of the whig party, " made the tories ride in triumph, and oc- " caſion'd the ſtraining, and *perhaps* not " ſufficiently explaining the points of prero- " gative and ſubjection." Methinks, this *perhaps*, is a very diminutive word, in a caſe where the ſafety of our whole Conſtitution was the thing depending. " You add, That " the doctrine of paſſive-obedience ſeem'd " equally eſpous'd by the court, the pulpit, " the bench, and the bar; and the humour " of the People, carry'd it to that height, " that it was dangerous to oppoſe it." But I can't perceive, that you in the mean time thought it needful or worth your while to drop the leaſt word by way of caution, let Ib. p. 695.

the conſequences prove what they would. You appear to be wholly of the mind of thoſe who cry'd up a *popiſh* ſucceſſor, as the only means to preſerve the *Church of England.*

You proceed to the *Oxford Decree*, condemning twenty-ſeven propoſitions, which paſs'd in the convocation there, on the very day of the Lord *Ruſſel*'s execution: But I can obſerve nothing like a cenſure on your part; nor any intimation given, that it was order'd by the Houſe of Peers to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman, after the trial of Dr. *Sacheverell* was over. This *Oxford Decree*, plainly raiſes paſſive-obedience, and indefeaſible hereditary right, to the utmoſt height. Had that been adher'd to, we had had no *Revolution*, and by conſequence no King GEORGE. Give me leave here to refer you to a clergyman of your own Church, who makes a greater figure than yourſelf, whom you have here deſerted, as cloſely as you follow him in remarks level'd againſt the Diſſenters. That gentleman frankly owns, "That many of the *Churchmen* "out of their zeal, carry'd the principles of "*prerogative* and *ſubjection*, to a much higher "degree than their forefathers had ever "thought of, or than they themſelves could "ever practiſe: And then adds, That upon "whatever order from any higher place this "*Oxford Decree* was drawn up by a ſingle perſon, and impos'd upon a Convocation in "ſurprize; whatever excuſe might be given "for the making, and the paſſing of it: Yet "there was this juſtice due to it at the *Revolution*, that it ſhould then have been adher'd "to, or as openly retracted and condemn'd.

Compleat Hiſt. of *Eng.* Vol. III. p. 419.

"Whereas

" Whereas the maker and chief promoters of
" it, did evidently contradict it, in their
" avow'd principles, and apparent practiſe,
" without any reverſal of it, or any other
" ſign of confeſſion, but only a tacit condem-
" nation of it, by privately ordering the
" printed copies of it to be taken away from
" the halls and other publick places, where
" they had before hung in triumph. A way
" of proceeding ſo offenſive to ſome of the
" younger ſtudents, that it occaſion'd ſome
" reflections and pieces of wit: Among
" others, this diſtich;

Cum fronti ſit nulla fides, ut carmina dicunt;
Cur tibi bifronti JANE *ſit ulla fides?*

AT length however, you yourſelf appear to be under ſome concern: And when King *James* comes to build upon King *Charles's* foundations, you own, " That his power and Vol. III.
" authority was brought to ſuch an height, p. 721.
" as had not been known for many years,
" and ſuch as might well prove formidable to
" a free and jealous people." And who may we thank for this, but thoſe that were for extending the prerogative of the Prince, whatever became of the freedom of the People? and could not be perſuaded it might be carryed too far? But what ſignifies your concern, which ſo ſoon wears off, that when you come to the declaration which the Divines that were preſent, made to the Duke of *Monmouth* upon the ſcaffold, " of his not dying a proteſtant Ibid. p.
" of the *Church of England*, if he did not own 772.
" the doctrine of the *Church of England*, in
" the point of non-reſiſtance," you han't the leaſt caveat to put in, notwithſtanding

the acknowledg'd *formidableneſs* of a power that was in no caſe to be reſiſted!

But at laſt your fear returns with a vengeance, and you are full of your complaints.

Ib. p. 797, 798. "King *James*, it ſeems, pretended to arbi-"trary and deſpotick power." And did not his brother lead him the way? And did not the clergy give both the one and the other a warrant? And what ſhould hinder him from doing what he would, after it had been ſo long inculcated, that it was not lawful to

Ibid. pag. 800. reſiſt upon any pretence whatſover? "He "violated the laws of the land." A proper complaint enough for ſuch as limited their obedience by the laws; but not ſo decent in the mouth, or from the pen of a paſſive-obe-

Ib. p. 843. dience man. "He gave people ſufficiently to underſtand that he deſign'd to ſhew ve-"ry little regard to the eſtabliſh'd laws of "the nation." 'Tis amazing, this ſhould not be underſtood before! However, 'tis better for people to open their eyes at laſt, than not at all: But then methinks, if they have kept them long clos'd, they ſhould not boaſt of their clear-ſightedneſs beyond their neighbours; nor defend the principles that kept their underſtandings in a miſt! However, I congratulate the gentlemen that recover-

Ib. p. 839. ed their eye-ſight. You tell us, "When the "King appointed a form of thankſgiving "for the Queen's being with child, the moſt "obnoxious expreſſions were omitted in the "reading it, by the greateſt part of the cler-"gy, and the day in moſt places was kept with "great coolneſs and indifferency:" And that when another thankſgiving was ordered for the birth of the ſuppos'd prince, "they were

Ib. p. 862. "for the moſt part ſilent and reſerv'd, as "doubting

" doubting the fact, and dreading the con-
" ſequence." Far be it from me upon this account to blame them: Only I cannot ſee why they might not have ſtopp'd much ſooner, and then we need not have been apprehenſive, either of arbitrary power, or a ſpurious heir.

" The Ordering the Declaration for Li- Ib. p.858.
" berty of Conſcience to be read in all the
" Churches, was (*you ſay*) an Attempt that
" help'd to bring all things to a Criſis. Could nothing then juſtify *Reſiſtance* but the Great danger of the church? Or could that juſtify it, if *reſiſtance* was *not lawful under any pretence whatſoever*? Solve the difficulty at your leiſure. 'Twas now it ſhould ſeem found out by the biſhops, upon their conſulting together, " That loyalty was nothing but obe- Ib. p.856.
" dience according to law." Thank you Sir, for your conceſſion. Had it been made ſooner, it had prevented a great deal of miſchief. But pray Sir don't forget, this was all along the Principle of thoſe whom you ſet yourſelf to oppoſe: though in them 'twas called *faction*. Such an obedience they none of them ever ſcrupled. 'Twas certainly ſomething more than this you were contending for all along before, or there is no difference at all between you and your Antagoniſts. But you tell us, the Biſhops were *ſtill for maintaining the principle of ſuffering, without any unchriſtian oppoſition*. I am far from thinking the oppoſition they made unchriſtian: But would fain know, how they could invite the Prince of *Orange*, to aſſiſt 'em againſt King *James*, as you own they did, without oppoſing him; or how their ſo inviting him can be reconcil'd with chriſtianity, if that makes *reſiſtance*

ſtance unlawful, under any pretence whatſoever. Commend me to the ingenuous confeſſion of **biſhop** *Burnet*, **who own'd in** ſo many words, " That the *Church of England* ſet her ſelf to " ſupport his Majeſty's Right and Succeſ- " ſion with ſo much Zeal, that ſhe there- " by not only put her ſelf in the power of " her Enemies, but alſo expos'd her ſelf to " the ſcorn of thoſe who inſulted over her " in her misfortunes." The only relief in the caſe was a retractation.

Anſwer to a Paper intit. A New Teſt of the Ch of England's Loyalty.

And you are forc'd to that in effect, tho' not willing to own it. When the pinch came, away goes the principle, " That reſiſtance is " not lawful upon any pretence whatſoever." And it was indeed high time to diſcard it, if we would have any thing preſerv'd: For we are told, " That all things at length " ſeem'd to conſpire to accompliſh the Ruin " of the proteſtant intereſt." Others clearly diſcern'd that they more than *ſeem'd* to do ſo, long before, and were for preventing it, but could not be liſten'd to. About ſeven years before this time, a number of as wiſe men as any in the kindgdom, met in Parliament, had according to your own relation, repreſented it to King *Charles* as their ſenſe, " That " there was no ſecurity or ſafety for the *pro-* " *teſtant religion*, or the government of this " nation, without paſſing a bill for diſabling " *James* duke of *York* to inherit the impe- " rial crown of this realm, and the domini- " ons and territories thereunto belonging: " And to rely upon any other means and re- " medies, was not only inſufficient but dan- " gerous." And when there was a great talk of *expedients*, you own the nation was freely told by Col. *Titus*, " That to accept

Vol. III. p. 864.

Ib. p. 605.

of

" of expedients to ſecure the *proteſtant religi-*
" *on*, after ſuch a King mounted the Throne,
" was as ſtrange as if there were a lion in
" the lobby, and they ſhould vote that they
" would rather ſecure themſelves, by letting
" him in and chaining him, than by keeping
" him out." But a number were for run-
ning the venture. And what was the fruit?
Why truly when one thouſand ſix hundred
eighty-eight came, " All found ſuch brea- Ib. p. 877.
" ches into the *Engliſh* conſtitution, as muſt
" ſhortly amount to a diſſolution or a total
" ſubverſion ". Nothing but feeling could
convince them. The brave Lord *Ruſſel* par-
ticularly gave fair warning, and declar'd in
the paper he left behind him, " That he be-
" liev'd popery was breaking in upon this
" nation; and that thoſe that advanc'd it
" would ſtop at nothing to carry on their
" deſign: And that he was heartily ſorry that
" ſo many proteſtants gave their helping hand
" to it." But it made little Impreſſion. Too
many were for making *a dangerous Experiment*,
which had it not been for the wonderful
Mercy of almighty God had been fatal. But
he was pleas'd to prevent it, " and a ſignal Ibid.
" Deliverance was brought on, in which you
" own, the arm of God ſeem'd more viſible
" than the hands and hearts of men." By
which ſugeſtion, you very fairly put us in
mind, how little we were oblig'd to thoſe men
or their principles, who had not *hearts* to uſe
their *hands* to do any thing towards our de-
liverance, till things were brought to ſuch
an Extremity, that it was ten thouſand to
one we had not been paſt recovery.

When you afterwards ſtart a plain Ob-
jection againſt the agents in the *Revolution*
the

the anſwer return'd appears very lame and
Ib. p. 880. defective. The objection, is, " That the
" Church had carried the doctrine of obe-
" dience farther than was conſiſtent with
" the ſafety of a proteſtant church, or the
" privilege of a free born people." Inſtead of an acknowledgement, which had been very becoming, you return an anſwer in the words of Biſhop *Sprat*: " That the main Bo-
" dy of thoſe who made ſo brave a ſtand,
" were all of the Church of *England*,
" and the principles on which they ſtood,
" were all *Church of England* principles. " Which anſwer tho' it came from a Biſhop, and is repeated by an Archdeacon, yet won't bear ſcanning. A celebrated author, (and he a Clergyman too) is of a quite different ſentiment, as to the former part of the anſwer. For he ſays, " That the Revo-
See Life of King *William* in 3 Vol. Vol. II. p. 143. " lution was without doubt accompliſh'd by
" the immediate Favour of divine Providence,
" and by the wiſdom of his Majeſty: (*King*
" *William.*) But whether the church-men or
" the presbyterians were more inſtrumen-
" tal in it, is a hard queſtion to deter-
" mine. " And if you were put to it, you'd find it no eaſy task to give good proof of the latter part of the anſwer, that they that were active in the Revolution, *ſtood upon church of England principles.* If I know any thing of *church of England principles*, and if either the acts that paſs'd in parliament, the *Oxford Decree*, or what came with one conſent from bar, bench, and pulpit in the reign of King *Charles*, or your hiſtory, can help me to underſtand them, they are againſt *reſiſtance upon any pretence whatſoever. Church of England principles* could not do any thing towards

wards our eminent deliverance, becauſe they excluded that *reſiſtance* without which it neither was, nor could have been compaſs'd. So that either they that have all along paſs'd for *Church of England principles*, and that you your ſelf have repreſented as ſuch, were not really ſuch, or it was not upon *Church of England principles*, that the *Revolution* was brought about. Extricate yourſelf here how you can.

You are afterwards angry with the Biſhops of *Scotland*, "for renouncing the prin- "ciples, on which the invaſion of the Prince "of *Orange* was founded." And what were theſe principles, but the lawfulneſs of a nation's defending itſelf, when in danger of ruin from tyrannical rulers; and the warrantableneſs of reſiſtance, in order to the maintaining and ſupporting Religion and Liberty? It was by renouncing theſe principles that the *Scots* loſt themſelves; and by conſequence, 'twas by eſpouſing them, that the *Engliſh* Biſhops ſav'd themſelves. And were theſe always their principles? Let the writings they publiſh'd, their votes in parliament, the oaths they were for impoſing, their reflections on their brethren, here be conſulted, and the matter will eaſily be determin'd. Thus then, in ſhort, the caſe ſtood. The Biſhops of *England* and *Scotland*, till the year 1688, equally renounc'd *reſiſting principles*. They had done ſo in a continu'd courſe from the reſtoration to that year. But then we were come to our laſt gaſp, and the Biſhops of *Scotland* ſtill perſiſted; but thoſe of *England* ſtopp'd ſhort, and left them in the lurch. If the *Engliſh* Biſhops were the moſt fortunate, it muſt be own'd the *Scottiſh* Biſhops were the moſt conſiſtent

Vol. III. p. 903.

ſiſtent with themſelves. If the latter were ruin'd, 'twas becauſe they ſtuck to their principles; and if the former were ſav'd, 'twas becauſe they chang'd. But they moſt certainly would have come off with more reputation, had they and their adherents when they acted againſt their former principles, in order to a deliverance from the dangers that threatned, been frank in acknowledging, That it was not owing to the principles they had all along maintain'd, but to their quitting them, that we were not ruin'd beyond recovery.

Ib. p. 909. YOU tell us, "King *James* found himſelf "deceiv'd." And well he might, when they who before declar'd *reſiſtance unlawful upon any pretence whatſoever*, on a ſudden *joyn'd with the* Ib. p. 912. *Prince of Orange*, againſt him, "for the defence "of the Proteſtant religion, and for maintain- "ing the ancient government, and the laws "and liberties of *England*, &c. as is ſignify'd "in the *Aſſociation*, which was firſt ſign'd at "*Exeter*, and afterwards by the Archbiſhop Ib. p. 151. "and other Biſhops at *Weſtminſter*." How this could be juſtify'd, if no reſiſtance was warrantable, and the old principles had been ſtill adher'd to, is paſt my skill to comprehend. If you are not opener upon this Point than hitherto, I doubt you'll be a little puzzled, if you proceed, as you ſeem inclin'd, to the reign of King *William*.

I freely own with you, That our eſcape when our danger was ſo very great, can be Pref. to call'd no leſs than "a mighty deliverance; Vol. III. "a deliverance in which the hand of Heaven "appear'd eminently viſible and conſpicuous. "*And yet while you are for* admiring the wiſdom "of Heaven, which has maturely and in due "ſeaſon brought about that eſtabliſhment,

"which

" which ſome factious and miſled perſons,
" by a crude anticipation, were weakly at-
" tempting in the latter end of King *Charles*
" the IId's reign, which in that juncture
" muſt in all probability, have involv'd three
" Kingdoms in blood:" I on the other hand am rather for admiring that merciful Providence, which has ſurprizingly brought about a deliverance for us, which ſome perſons that were deſigning, and others that were weak, by an unaccountable infatuation, were furiouſly ſtriving in the latter end of King *Charles* the IId's reign to render impracticable; and which was not at laſt to be compaſs'd without our being brought within an hair's breadth of ruin. And whereas (as you intimate, and I readily agree) *there ſprung from the prolifick womb of our Revolution, a numberleſs ſeries of Bleſſings which reviv'd many parts of* Europe; I reckon we are the more indebted for 'em to a ſpecial Providence, becauſe they could not be brought forth, without our being at a great expence of blood and treaſure, which muſt all be plac'd to the account of thoſe, who were not by all the arguments that could be urg'd upon them, to be brought to prefer fore-thought before after-wit; nor are now to be convinc'd they were at all in the wrong, becauſe they brought us only to the brink of that ruin, which we might have kept at a diſtance from, had we acted like a people that had eyes in their heads. And methinks it is a good evidence, that my view and ſcheme is preferable to yours, and more conſiſtent with itſelf, in that the deliverance which you and I agree in extolling, was no ſooner compaſs'd than ſuch an *excluſion* was agreed to, as before was repreſented as moſt Ibid.

abſurd, irrational and illegal, and had been the main hinge upon which the controverſy between the two contending parties turn'd. For preſently after the *Revolution*, an Act paſs'd the two Houſes, and had the royal aſſent, in which there is this remarkable clauſe:

Ann. 1. Gul. & Mariæ. Seſſ. 2. Cap. 2.

" Whereas it has been found by experience, " that it is inconſiſtent with the ſafety and " welfare of this Proteſtant Kingdom, to be " govern'd by a Popiſh Prince, or by any " King or Queen marrying a Papiſt, the ſaid " Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Com- " mons, do farther pray, that it may be en- " acted, That all and every perſon, and per- " ſons that is, are, or ſhall be reconcil'd to, " or ſhall hold communion with the See or " *Church of Rome*, or ſhall profeſs the Popiſh " religion, or ſhall marry a Papiſt, ſhall be " excluded, and be for ever uncapable to in- " herit, poſſeſs or enjoy the crown, and go- " vernment of this Realm, and *Ireland*, and " the Dominions thereunto belonging, or any " part of the ſame, or to have, uſe or exer- " ciſe any regal Power, Authority or Juriſ- " diction within the ſame; and in all and " every ſuch caſe or caſes, the People of " theſe Realms ſhall be, and are hereby ab- " ſolv'd of their Allegiance; and the ſaid " crown and government ſhall from time to " time, deſcend to, and be enjoy'd by, ſuch " perſon or perſons, being Proteſtants, as " ſhould have inherited and enjoy'd the ſame " in caſe the ſaid perſon or perſons ſo re- " concil'd, holding communion, or profeſ- " ſing, or marrying as aforeſaid, were na- " turally dead." So that without a *Bill of Excluſion* carry'd, we had never had King GEORGE, nor the Bleſſings we hope for from his

his illuſtrious Family. And as far as I can ſee, it's but a vain thing, to talk of being *diſcourag'd by the rage and blindneſs of Parties*, if you let your account of ſuch things as theſe, paſs uncorrected.

ANOTHER thing in your hiſtory, which I am not a little ſurpriz'd at, is, that you ſhould with ſo much freedom and openneſs declare yourſelf, upon ſeveral matters, where you could not be inſenſible you were liable to much counter-evidence and oppoſition. The great Inſtance here is the *Popiſh Plot*, which made ſo great a noiſe, not only here, but all over *Europe*. For my part, I ſee no reaſon to doubt but that there was a Popiſh Plot againſt this land all along from the Reſtoration: And it was carry'd on very plainly in *Ireland*, in 1665, and 1666, and 1667, as is evident by the Teſtimony of *Florence Wyer*, and ſeveral other Papiſts; and the dealings of the *Iriſh* with the *French* in order to bring in Popery, is very plain in *Plunket*'s Trial. And as for the Plot that was diſcover'd in 1678, it was believ'd by four ſeveral ſucceſſive Parliaments, in which perhaps there were perſons of as good ſenſe, as ever were ſummon'd by the writs of a K. of *England*, or choſen by the People. And yet this you run down; as not having the leaſt foundation. Nay, your account of this, you ſeem to reckon your Maſter-piece.

FOR you declare as to the Plot, "That "you have been more than ordinary careful "in tracing out the ſteps, and examining in- "to the bottom of that myſtery of villany: "And that if you have not done it ſo perfect- "ly as it deſerves, you have done it more "compleatly and regularly than it is to be "found

Pref. to Vol. III.

" found in any ſingle Writer before you;
" and that you believe you have ſet the whole
" in a better light than it has been generally
" ſeen in before; and if that Plot appears to
" be another thing than what it has been
" commonly taken for, it is owing to evi-
" dence and conviction, more than to hu-
" mour and opinion." This I muſt confeſs is pretty ſtrong. But it is no new thing for a man that has the *jaundice*, to fancy his friends go to perſuade him out of his ſenſes, that would induce him to believe that the objects that are before him, are not of the colour in which they appear to him: Which I take to be much your caſe.

All that I can make of your account of this *Popiſh Plot*, is, That it was a contrivance of the Lord *Shaftsbury*'s, to unhinge the Government: And that he making uſe of the Dread of *Popery* that was then ſtirring in the Nation, and a variety of other incidents and occaſions, and tampering with ſome that were weak, and getting the aſcendant over others that were deſigning Men, and having ſome tools that were very needy, and ready to ſwear any thing they could gain by, and others to work upon that were eaſily terrify'd and ſcar'd, manag'd his engines ſo, as for a good while to keep King *Charles* himſelf in awe, and to frighten the Privy-Council, ſeveral ſucceſſive Parliaments, our Judges, and Juries, and in ſhort, the whole Nation out of their wits; and then cunningly turn'd all to the ſerving of his own purpoſes, in running down the Papiſts, and expoſing the Duke, 'till he had almoſt excluded him from the Throne. By putting things together, this ſeems to be your ſcheme, as it was the ſcheme of one

that

that went before you, whom you mention among your Authors; who tells us, that *Tong* unkennell'd the Fox, and *Shaftsbury* the Maſter of the blood-hounds govern'd the Chace. L'Eſtran. Brief Hiſtory of the times. Part II. p. 85.

Now, tho' I'll readily own with you, "It "is not to be expected, that every ſentence "ſhould be ſupported by a particular Au- "thority," yet when a matter of this nature, that as to the main of it was believ'd by ſo many parliaments, and by the whole body of the Nation, is run down and banter'd, the Authority had need be very good: It ſhould be more than ordinary. Believe me, Sir, licking up the ſpittle of ſuch a tool of a party, ſuch a popiſh penſioner as *L'Eſtrange*, and tranſcribing his *Hiſtory of the Times*, (a viler book than which my eyes never ſaw) won't do in ſuch a cauſe. There needs ſomewhat more authentick, than the confident ſtrains of one who you know is repreſented by an eminent Prelate of your Church, as "a buf- "foon that was hir'd to plague the Nation, "with three or four papers a week, which "to the reproach of the age, (he ſays) had "but too great and too general an effect, in "poyſoning the ſpirits of the Clergy." Pref. to Vol. III. Bp. Burnets Apol. for the Ch. Eng.

As far as my memory ſerves me, the beſt evidence you produce to prove this Plot a ſhamm and forgery, is a paſſage, which you ſay, was related by K. *Charles* himſelf to a perſon of full credit, (tho' you don't name him) from whom you had it. It is this; "That *Oates* "and *Tong* being at a great entertainment in "the City, which was provided for them by "twenty rich Citizens, quarrell'd before all "the Company: At which time *Tong* told "*Oates*, (the chief evidence) that he knew Vol. III. pag 472.

"no-

" nothing of the Plot, but what he learn'd " from him." This paſſage which you tell us, was not hitherto publiſh'd, was, what you intimate, confirm'd the King in the diſbelief of the Plot; and it ſhould look as if you would inſinuate, that it might reaſonably influence others the ſame way. But this ſtory does not ſound well. It's pretty much that ſuch a number of Citizens as twenty, ſhould hear ſuch a paſſage, about a matter of ſo great moment, and all keep it to themſelves, and you be the firſt publiſher of it ſo long after! It's a very ſurprizing thing that it ſhould not come out ſooner. Had the Papiſts, who wanted not for diligence, got it by the end, it might have done them ſpecial ſervice, and been ſo improv'd as to have help'd to ſave the lives of a number of their friends, whom they would gladly have preſerv'd at any rate. Had it come to the ears of *L'Eſtrange*, it would have been of no ſmall uſe to him in writing his *Hiſtory of the Times*, and particularly the ſecond part of it; in which he undertakes to " ſhew the pretend- " ed Popiſh Plot to have been quite another " thing than it has been taken for:" Which undertaking of his methinks (by the way) moſt wonderfully harmonizes with the account you give, of your own performance as to this Plot. That Author triumphs enough as it is; repreſenting (with all the aſſurance in the world) *Tong* as managing the whole affair of the Plot from one end to t'other. He tells a great number of Stories: As that " *Simpſon Tong* confeſs'd and proteſted, that the " Plot was contriv'd by his Father and *Oats*. But that Son was a known profligate wretch, whom no one regarded. And he tells us of a

Brief Hiſtory of the times. Part II. chap. 10. Ibid. Part I. p 37.

ſquabble

ſquabble between *Oates* and *Tong* in the lobbey, who was the firſt diſcoverer. But had he got your ſtory by the end, of twenty rich citizens preſent at a conteſt between them two upon that ſubject, he would have triumph'd much more, and made woful work on't, and worried us to death with it. However, methinks 'tis much, that you ſhould not be able to find out one of the twenty citizens to bring him in as a voucher. And why ſhould you not tell us the name, that the world may judge as to the credit of your informer, in a matter of ſo great conſequence? I ſhould be a little ſurpriz'd if any perſon that was unprejudic'd, ſhould think this outweigh'd what may be thrown into the other ſcale. Ibid. Part II. p. 95, 96.

THE two main evidences of the reality of this plot, beſides the depoſitions of *Oates* and *Bedlow*, &c. were the letters of Mr. *Coleman*, who was ſecretary to the Duke of *York*, and the murder of Sir *Edmund Bury Godfrey*, which *L'Eſtrange* calls *the two ſtilts of the plot*. Your way of evading both, appears borrow'd from that celebrated author, as no man can forbear obſerving, that compares his account and yours together. Brief Hiſtory of the times. Part I. p. 145.

" AS to *Coleman*'s Letters, (that author " ſays) they were a particular matter of a " perſonal practice, and undertaking; and " his crime at the uttermoſt ſtretch of it, " amounted to no more than a forward in- " termeddling with ſtate matters, without a " commiſſion. He had a plot upon fingring " *French* money; but without any malice a- " gainſt either the king or government." And you very readily chime in with him, and tell us, " That theſe Letters ſhew him to be ve- " ry bold and pragmatical, working hard " for Ibid. Part II. p. 39. Vol. III. p. 484.

" for money, as well as the advancement of " his religion; promiſing by the power of " that to diſſolve and make parliaments, and " to do many other great things improper " to his ſtation." But there you ſtop. The *criminal part* of the Letters you have little to ſay to. Whereas the trial makes him appear to die as juſtly as ever any man did.

Brief Hiſtory of the times. Part III. p. 161.

And as to the ſtory of Sir *Edm. Bury Godfrey*'s murder, *L'Eſtrange* ſays, " It is wholly " inconſiſtent with itſelf; and never was " any thing more ridiculouſly projected, " more ſcandalouſly atteſted, or upon com- " paring of evidences, more impoſſible to be " true. And you ſay, " That this murder " was immediately charg'd upon the papiſts, " and was made not only a part, but the " grand ſupporter of the credit of the plot:" Which looks the ſame way, eſpecially, when you afterwards add, " That the ſtory had " inſuperable difficulties, and inconſiſtencies. 'Tis hard to find any thing more ridiculous, than the account you give of the paper brought to *Prance* in *Newgate*: And you intimate that *Green*, *Berry* and *Hill*, who loſt their lives as murderers, had but hard meaſure. And yet you yourſelf own, that Sir *William Scroggs*, who was Lord chief Juſtice at that tryal, when the Jury brought them in guilty, expreſs'd himſelf in theſe remarkable words: " Gentlemen, you have found the " ſame verdict that I would have found, if I " had been one with you; and if it were the " laſt words I were to ſpeak in this world, " I ſhould have pronounc'd them guilty." Now for you, tho' you mention'd this, to repreſent the things which thoſe criminals had to alledge in their defence as material,

Vol. III. p. 467.

pag. 505.

Ib. p. 513, 514.

Ibid. p. 515.

and

and to come with ſuch a flurt as that, that " the ſtory was invented by ſome body elſe " of a greater capacity," has a peculiar aſpect. It looks but ill in *L'Eſtrange*, but it looks much worſe in a dignify'd clergyman, at this rate to arraign the Juſtice of the nation. p. 509.

As for *L'Eſtrange*, he ſays, " That we " are not more certain of any thing, than " we are morally ſure, that the pompous " hiſtory of the pretended villany of the " murder, has been from end to end of it a " ſtate-cheat, and no other than a palpable " impoſture. And as for the conſpiracy in " general, that coſt ſo many innocent lives, " and wrought ſo much miſchief both to " King and people, (he ſays) it was only " ſcandalous impoſture, bolſter'd up with " perjury and ſubornation." And you ſeem to be much of the ſame mind, by the account you have given of it. For the fartheſt you can go upon the whole, is to own, " That the " popiſh party had given too great an occaſion " of ſuſpicion, and had been too buſy and induſtrious in promoting and propagating a " religion and a cauſe, that was inconſiſtent " with the government and genius of *England*." But as for a conſpiracy, you ſeem to know nothing of it. Brief Hiſtory of the times. Part II. p. 48. Vol. III. pag. 599.

WHEREAS I think to a man that is willing to be ſatisfy'd, there is what may be ſufficient for his conviction, if we had no more than the *Votes* of the two Houſes of Parliament. For the Commons, *Oct.* 31, 1678. " Reſolv'd, *nemine contradicente*, That upon the evidence " that has appear'd to this Houſe, this Houſe " is of opinion, that there is, and has been, " a damnable and helliſh plot, contriv'd and Vol. III. pag. 474.

" carry'd on by popiſh recuſants, for aſſaſ-
" ſinating and murdering the King, for ſub-
" verting the Government, and rooting out
" and deſtroying the proteſtant Religion:
Ib. p. 526. In which the Lords alſo readily concurr'd. And in the next Parliment alſo, the Commons came to this unanimous grand reſolve; " That
" the Houſe doth declare, that they are fully
" ſatisfy'd by the proofs they have heard,
" that there now is, and for divers years laſt
" paſt hath been, a horrid and treaſonable
" plot and conſpiracy, contriv'd and car-
" ried on by thoſe of the popiſh religion, for
" the murthering his Majeſty's ſacred perſon,
" and for ſubverting the proteſtant Religion,
" and the ancient and well-eſtabliſh'd govern-
" ment of this kingdom." And to theſe I think it not amiſs to add, Sir *William Jones*'s ſpeech at the tryal of the Lord *Stafford*. That gentleman was attorney general while the plot was proſecuted, had all the papers relating to it before him, and could not but know very well how diſagreeable to the court ſuch proſecutions were. And yet in the tryal of the
La: Staffords Trial p. 169, 170. Lord *Stafford*, where he was a manager, he expreſs'd himſelf thus: " My Lords, I think
" I may take leave to ſay, that the plot in ge-
" neral hath been now ſufficiently prov'd.
" And if we conſider what has been prov'd at
" former tryals, upon which many of the of-
" fenders and traitors have been executed,
" what hath been publiſh'd in print, and above
" all *Coleman*'s Letters, written all with his
" own hand, and for that reaſon impoſſible to
" be falſify'd, we may juſtly conclude, that
" there is not a man in *England* of any under-
" ſtanding, but muſt be fully convinc'd of the
" truth of the plot in general, *&c.* So that

I think

" I think now none remain, that do pre-
" tend not to believe it, but two ſorts of
" perſons, the one thoſe that were conſpi-
" rators in it, and the other thoſe that wiſh'd
" it had ſucceeded. " And I ſhould think that there are few ſenſible perſons, but what will have a greater regard to this gentleman's aſſurance, than to the confident ſtrains of *L'Eſtrange* on the oppoſite ſide. Upon the whole, I think your account of this plot well needs a reviſal, as ever you would convince your readers, " That truth and fidelity are " your principal aims. Pref. to Vol. I.

NEITHER are you leſs warm and eager in aſſerting the truth, reality, and horridneſs of the *proteſtant plot*, than you are in running down that of the *papiſts* as a meer ſhamm. The *Rye-houſe* conſpiracy is with you exactly true. And nothing can be more eaſy than it is to obſerve, how much more of tenderneſs you diſcover, for thoſe that ſuffer'd for the *popiſh plot*, than for the ſufferers for that which was call'd the *presbyterian plot*; and how much more favourable you are to the evidences in one caſe, than in the other. Your great author here is Biſhop *Sprat*, who wrote the hiſtory of the *Rye-houſe conſpiracy*; a ſpecial book to convey a true account to poſterity! But I ſhould have thought, if the belief of a Biſhop had been ſuch an evidence with you, the many more who in their parliamentary capacity declar'd their full belief of the *popiſh plot*, might have been allow'd to outweigh. You have quoted one thing from Biſhop *Sprat*, which I believe had it never been corrected, would have heighten'd the credit of the reporter with but very few. 'Tis this: " That the paper which my " Lord Vol. III. p. 164.

Vol. III. p. 143. " Lord *Ruſſel* left behind him, was *full of enormous falſhoods* : Of which the proof given is this: " That the private confeſſions of " the Duke of *Monmouth* and Mr. *Carſtaires*, " made his Lordſhip appear more acquainted with the tranſactions of the conſpirators, than he was willing to acknowledge. " His Lordſhip was as poſitive and full as he well could be. He declar'd by word of mouth to the ſheriff, " That he knew of no plot, " either againſt the King's life, or the government; and that in the words of a dying man. " And in his Paper he ſolemnly declar'd, " That he lov'd his Country much " more than his life; and never had any " deſign of changing the government; and " would always have been ready to venture " his life, for the preſerving it; and would " ſuffer any extremity, rather than have " conſented to any deſign of taking away " the King's life, &c. and that as he had not " any deſign againſt the King's life, or the " life of any man whatſoever, ſo he never " was in any contrivance of altering the " government. " So that if he was in a conſpiracy againſt the government, in the way and manner that the Biſhop's hiſtory repreſents, he muſt leave the world with a groſs lie in his mouth. As to the two evidences that the Biſhop produces that he was guilty of *enormous falſhoods*, viz. the Duke of *Monmouth* and Mr. *Carſtaires*; as I think that there is but very little likelyhood that the former would make any ſuch confeſſion as would give a juſt foundation for ſuch a charge, ſo I am well aſſur'd that the latter neither did, nor could do it. I therefore think there is but little likelyhood, that the former would make

make any ſuch confeſſion as would give a juſt foundation for a charge of that nature, againſt my Lord *Ruſſel*, becauſe in the accounts we have publiſhed, of what paſs'd between King *Charles* and the Duke, after his ſurrendring himſelf, and making his Peace, we are told of ſome diſcourſe they had with reſpect to that Lord, which intimated the Duke's moſt tender affection and peculiar reſpect for him, which would not be any way to be reconcil'd with his bringing any ſuch charge againſt him. Tho' you have omitted this, you'll find it in the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, and in the Duke of *Monmouth*'s Pocket book. And then as for Mr. *Carſtaires*, I can with aſſurance ſay, that he never did bring ſuch a charge againſt the Lord *Ruſſel*, becauſe I had it from his own mouth. Nay he could not do it: For he has with ſolemnity declar'd to me, that all that he knew with relation to thoſe conſultations for which he was call'd in queſtion, was that ſeveral lovers of their country were with concern conſidering together how they might beſt preſerve their religion and liberty, which they apprehended to be in no ſmall danger: And that if what came from him while he was under torture, was put together, it would not be found to amount to more than this. And therefore he could not charge my Lord *Ruſſel* with any thing of that nature that you quote Biſhop *Sprat* for. And I apprehend you yourſelf will be ſatisfy'd of this, if you'll but caſt your eyes upon the account given by Mr. *Pierce* in his *Vindication of the Diſſenters*, which Account was ſent to him in a letter from Mr. *Carſtaires* himſelf, that was drawn up at my requeſt, and paſt though my Hands. In ſhort,

Vol. III. p. 415.

See Appendix to Dr. Welwood's Memoirs. Num. 14. pag. 375.

Part I. p. 255, 256, 257, 258.

ſhort, the converſation I had with this worthy gentleman, (who was one I could depend upon) is to me better evidence that the main of that conſpiracy lay in conſidering how they might beſt ſcreen themſelves from the dangers which they found hung over their heads, than any I can find produc'd by you, that there was any thing more in it. For as for Dr. *Sprat*'s hiſtory, I freely acknowledge I have very little regard to it. 'Twas drawn up to pleaſe the court, by one that was wholly in that Intereſt. And he himſelf acknowledges, that King *James* II. "called for his "papers, and having read them, alter'd di- "vers paſſages, and caus'd them to be prin- "ted by his own Authority." And who can pretend to ſay how far the alterations made might go? And be able to diſtinguiſh between what is the King's and what the Biſhop's? I ſhall only add the account given by the writer of King *William*'s life, who ſays, "That the eloquent pen of Dr. *Sprat* was "induſtriouſly ſet to work to varniſh over "and palliate the flaws of *Keeling*'s, and the "other witneſſes depoſitions. Accordingly "he publiſh'd an account of the horrid con- "ſpiracy againſt the late King, his preſent "Majeſty, and the government, adorn'd "with all thoſe flouriſhes of oratory, which "are ſo far from perſuading, that they ra- "ther give truth an air of fiction. But "however as affairs were then managed, a "romance was as fit to ſerve the court as a "true hiſtory." And if the credit of this "book fails, the plot falls together with it.

See the Bp. of Rocheſt. two Letters to the E. of Dorſet. edit. Oct. p. 12.

Vol. I. p. 172.

But it deſerves a remark withall, that Biſhop *Sprat* himſelf, having been oft upbraided on the acconnt of his undeſerved reflection on

on

my Lord *Ruſſel*, own'd at length in Print, " That he was fully convinc'd by Diſcourſe " with the Reverend Dean of *Canterbury*, of " that noble gentleman's great probity, and " conſtant abhorrence of falſhood. By which acknowledgment the Biſhop publickly retracted his having charg'd that Lord with *enormous Falſhoods*. And you by repeating this charge, without taking any notice of this ſubſequent acknowledgment, have at once been unjuſt, both to the Biſhop whom you cite, and to the memory of my Lord *Ruſſel*, by endeavouring to perpetuate a groundleſs Calumny.

See Bp. of Rocheſt. two Letters to the E. of *Dorſet*, ed. in Oct. p. 13.

OF all thoſe concern'd in that which was commonly called the *Fanatick-Plot*, none is generally reckon'd to have had worſe uſage, than the Earl of *Eſſex*, who loſt his Life in the Tower. And it really amazes me to find you ſo confident, that he murder'd himſelf there. Nay you lay in for this long before the fatal Stroke, and prepare People for it, when you give an account of the Father's exit. You this way either diſcover a peculiar Fondneſs for his being taken for his own Executioner, or at leaſt ſhew your good will, by taking a method that has a tendency to cauſe it to make the deeper Impreſſion upon your Readers. And I muſt needs ſay, if it really was by his own hands, that this noble Earl loſt his Life, he diſcovered an hearty good will to diſpatch himſelf! He ſhew'd he was in earneſt in the fact; in that he cut through Wind-pipe, and Gullet, and both the Jugulars, even to the *Vertebræ* of the neck! A like Inſtance with which won't eaſily be produc'd. And it is pretty much he ſhould happen to do it juſt at that Time when the King and the Duke were in

Vol. III. p. 689.

Vol. III. p. 660.

the Tower, where they had not been in many years before; and on the very Day of the Tryal of the Lord *Ruſſel*, as if he intended to give an Advantage againſt that Noble Lord, to thoſe who before were ſufficiently diſpoſed to condemn him, and who did improve it to purpoſe, at the *Old Baily*, as ſoon as they receiv'd the news of it. And it muſt be own'd to look a little ſuſpicious, that the Earl's Body ſhould be taken out of the cloſet where the Fact was committed; and that it ſhould be ſtripp'd, and the cloſet alſo waſh'd, and the cloathes carry'd away, before the Jury was impannell'd. The attending Officers could not be ſo unacquainted with the Law in this caſe, as not to know, that theſe things ought not to have been done. And tho' a Juryman that was inquiſitive into the Reaſon of theſe Proceedings, was told that it was the Body, and not the Cloathes they were to ſit upon, yet as they, according to Law, ought to have had the ſight of the body in its Cloathes, and in the Poſture in which it was firſt found, ſo is it evident, they might this way have made ſome Diſcoveries: And it looks as if they that had the Management of Matters, were willing herein to prevent them. And why ſhould the Jury be told, that the King had ſent for the Inquiſition, and be urg'd to diſpatch it, before the Relations were conſulted, if there was no Deſign to be this way ſerv'd? If the Relations did afterwards acquieſce in the Verdict of the Jury, who brought him in *Felo de ſe*, it is eaſy enough to conceive, that their finding it to no purpoſe to contend with the Court, who now carry'd all before them with an high Hand, and their deſire to ſecure the Honour and

Eſtate,

Eſtate, was the occaſion of it. And ſuppoſe the Earl might ſometimes have pleaded for the Lawfulneſs of *Self-murder*, I can't ſee that that is a convincing Argument, that he actually was a Self-murderer, when there are ſo many concurring Circumſtances, giving juſt Ground of ſuſpicion, that the Court whoſe Turn was remarkably ſerv'd by it, had a Hand in diſpatching him. You are pleas'd to complain of "the nice Taſte of ſome, and the "wrong Taſte of others:" But if you let ſuch things as theſe paſs uncorrected, I'm afraid you'll be charg'd with contributing to the vitiating the Taſte both of the preſent and ſucceeding Ages. And I leave to your ſedate Thoughts, whether there will not be ſome Reaſon for it. — Pref. to Vol. II. p. 1.

And now my Hand is in, give me leave a little to vent my Concern, that a Man of your character ſhould upon ſo many Occaſions in the whole current of your Hiſtory, diſcover ſo little regard to the true Intereſt of your Country. Tho' my Lord *Clarendon* wrote his Hiſtory with a deſign to his utmoſt to vindicate King *Charles* I, in his conteſt with the long Parliament, yet he freely owns and cenſures ſeveral of his miſmanagements, and points to the Miſtakes that were committed in his Reign, both in Church and State. He blames him for his unreaſonable, unskilful, and precipitate diſſolutions of Parliaments; his long Intermiſſions of them, and his unprecedented, and juſtly exceptionable Methods of getting Supplies, during thoſe Intermiſſions. He intimates, that in order to get Money, "unjuſt Projects of all kinds, many ridiculous, "and many ſcandalous, and all very grievous "to the Subjects, were ſet on foot." And Hiſt. of the Reb. Vol. I. p. 67, & 69.

he calls the Determination about *Ship Money*, "A Logick which left no Man any thing that "he could call his own." And this ſhews, that notwithſtanding his Zeal for the Prerogative, he had yet a concern for *Liberty and Property*. I ſhould be glad to find any thing of this nature in you, who are rather for palliating, than cenſuring Irregularities; and tho' you now and then hint that ſome things were thought illegal, yet you tell us in the general, in your *Introduction*, that you had another View, which was inſtead of declaring againſt them, ſo to draw up your Account, as to do what in you lay to give your Readers Satisfaction, "That if there "appear'd any Miſmanagements or Miſcar-"riages in the Government, tho' they were "of no threatning Conſequence in them-"ſelves, they yet were liable to be made fa-"tal by the Aggravations and Miſrepreſen-"tations of deſigning Men." You tell us, you have ſometimes improv'd my Lord *Clarendon:* But I hope you have better Inſtances to produce than this, if there ſhould be occaſion.

Vol. II. p. 2.

Pref. to Vol. II. pag. 6.

The great Grievances of the Reign of King *Charles* II, were the Growth of *Popery*; the being ſway'd by the Counſels of the *French*, who were viſibly aſpiring after an *univerſal Monarchy*; and *arbitrary Power:* And I cannot perceive that you, Sir, declare againſt any one of them, in ſuch a manner as would have become a Friend of your Country, and our Legal Conſtitution.

As to *the Growth of Popery*, it was freely complain'd of by the Parliaments of this Reign from one Seſſion to another; and many Grounds were alledg'd to juſtify their Apprehenſions

henſions concerning it: As the Advancement of known Papiſts to Places of Power, the free reſort of Prieſts and Jeſuits into theſe *Britiſh* Iſlands, the Marriage of the Duke of *York* into the Family of the Duke of *Modena*, and the Proſpect of that Duke's Succeſſion to the Crown, *&c.* But you in the Courſe of your Hiſtory appear to make Light of all, as if *the Growth of Popery* was but the Pretence of a Party, to cover other Deſigns.

THE Influence of *French* Counſels was then another grand Complaint, and reckon'd by our Patriots to expoſe us to no ſmall Danger. To this we muſt aſcribe the Sale of *Dunkirk*, the pernicious Conſequences of which might eaſily be foreſeen: But this you rather juſtify than otherwiſe; telling us, "That at "that time, we don't find many Complaints a- "gainſt it." 'Twas the *French* that rais'd Jealouſies between us and the *Hollanders*, which occaſion'd the firſt *Dutch* War, with an Intention to ſee us deſtroy each other, or at leaſt weaken and exhauſt ourſelves, that they might with leſs Oppoſition encreaſe their Naval Strength; and yet this War you applaud. 'Tis true, the Lords and Commons chearfully contributed to the Charge of it: But it is no difficult Matter, now to diſcern, under whoſe Influence it was that they did it. And tho' you ſignify, that the ſolemn Faſt appointed throughout the Kingdom, upon the Occaſion of the ſecond *Dutch* War, "was indeed a "Day of Sorrow and Humiliation to many "diſcerning Perſons;" yet ſo little are you for *ſuſpecting the Intrigues of the Court*, that you appear more concern'd for the *Indulgence to the Diſſenters*, with which it was attended, than for the Tendency it had to ſtrengthen the

Vol. III. pag. 84.

Ibid. pag. 116, *&c.*

Ib. p. 298.

Ib. p. 294.

French

French Intereſt. And purſuant hereto, you are all along for ſcreening the Earl of *Danby*, who was freely charg'd with being long a *French* Penſioner, while he was at the Head of our *Engliſh* Counſels, whatever he might be afterwards.

ARBITRARY *Power*, which is what ſo many in this Reign were ſo much afraid of, to you appears a meer Bugbear; and the Dreading it, you repreſent as a great Weakneſs. Ib. p. 634. You applaud the King's *Declaration touching the Cauſes and Reaſons that mov'd him to diſſolve his two laſt Parliaments:* And ſeem well pleas'd with the Seizure or Surrendral of the Charter Ib. p. 665. of *London*, and thoſe of other Corporations, which ſtood in the way of an abſolute Government. And all you have to ſay of the Matter, is, "That the Reins of Government "were now held with a more ſtrict and ſteady Hand, than in ſeveral Years before." But I ſhould have thought you ſhould here have conſider'd the Act of Parliament, that paſs'd after the *Revolution*, "for reverſing Ann. 1. Guil. & Mariæ. Seſſ. 1. Cap. 8. "the Judgment in a *Quo Warranto* againſt "the City, *&c.* which runs thus: Whereas a Judgment was given in the Court of "*Kings-Bench*, in or about *Trinity*-Term in "the 35th Year of the Reign of the late King "*Charles* II, upon an Information in the nature of a *Quo Warranto*, exhibited in the "ſaid Court, againſt the Mayor, and Commonalty, and Citizens of the City of *London*, "that the Liberty, Privilege and Franchiſe, of "the ſaid Mayor, and Commonalty, and Citizens, being a Body politick and corporate, "ſhould be ſeiz'd into the King's Hands as forfeited: And foraſmuch as the ſaid Judgment, and Proceedings thereupon is, and

"were

" were ILLEGAL and ARBITRARY; And " for that the Reſtoring of the ſaid Mayor, " and Commonalty and Citizens, to their an- " cient Liberties of which they had been de- " priv'd, tends very much to the Peace and " good Settlement of this Kingdom: Be it de- " clar'd and enacted, *&c.*" When your Hiſto- ry comes to another Impreſſion, if you muſt needs have the Text remain unalter'd, I move that you will print this Preamble to the Act of Parliament for the reſtoring the City Charter, as a Note in the Margin, that ſo the Reader may the better be able to paſs a Judgment. I forbear the Reflections which ſuch a method as this of writing the Hiſtory of your native Country would lead to, and juſtify, for fear of heating you. And ſhall leave you to your own farther Thoughts about it.

ONLY there is one thing that is of that Moment, that I know not how to let it paſs without a particular Remark: It relates to that *wonderful Infatuation* which you apprehend the *Whigg* Party were under, that thoſe *Expedients* and Conceſſions which were offer'd to evade the *Bill of Excluſion*, ſhould not be accepted: This out of your abundant kindneſs, (or from what other Principle you beſt know) you tell us " muſt be from the " Spirit of Faction or Deluſion, or an unac- " countable Mixture of both." But you have a fair Account enough of that Matter, (had you thought fit to have taken notice of it) in my Lord *Ruſſel*'s Paper. Mentioning the *Bill of Excluſion*, he has theſe remarkable Words; " I (ſays he) thought the Nation in " ſuch Danger of Popery, and that the expe- " ctation of a Popiſh Succeſſor put the King's " Life likewiſe in ſo much Danger, that

Vol. III. p. 542.

" I

" I ſaw no way ſo effectual to ſecure both, as " ſuch a Bill. As to the *Limitations* that were " propos'd, if they were ſincerely offer'd, and " had paſs'd into a Law, the Duke then would " have been excluded from the Power of a " King, and the Government quite alter'd, " and little more than the Name of King " left: So I could not ſee either Sin or " Fault in the one, when all People were " willing to admit of the other; but thought " it better to have a King with his Prero- " gative, and the Nation eaſy and ſafe un- " der him, than a King without it; which " would breed perpetual Jealouſies, and a " continual Struggle." This carries ſo much plain and ſtrong Senſe in it, that I ſhould have thought it might have deſerv'd your Conſide- ration: And when you have view'd and con- ſider'd it again and again, it will be hard to find either *Faction* or *Deluſion* in it. And if you will but ſtand to your own Maxim, That *an Hiſtorian ought never to be of a Par- ty*, you cannot but be free to own as much; and that the rather, becauſe the Principle men- tion'd by my Lord *Ruſſel* in his Paper, is what the Convention-Parliament fell in with, after a cloſe Debate, about a *Regent* or a *King*, after the *Abdication*.

Pref. to Vol. I.

Pref. to Vol. II. p. 6.

You ſeem to boaſt much of your being ſo *impartial*. And tho' you own, " That a " ſtrict Impartiality is ſo rare a Quality in " moſt Writers of Hiſtory, that many are " ready to think, an impartial Hiſtorian is " a Man not to be found in the World; (yet " you freely declare) that Impartiality has " always been your great Aim." And no- thing is more eaſy to be obſerv'd, than that all Writers in this reſpect are apt to have fa- vourable

vourable thoughts of themſelves; while yet their readers will ſet up for cenſors, and paſs ſentence according to their own judgment. For my part, after the ſtricteſt ſearch for your *impartiality*, I cannot ſay, that you have dealt forth your favours to the *Papiſts* and the *diſſenters*, with an equal hand. Perhaps you might not think the doing ſo, neceſſary to prove your *impartiality*: And yet I believe there is a conſiderable number of your readers, that are of opinion, your hiſtory had not wanted any of its ornaments, if you had either been leſs favourable to the *papiſts*, or leſs eager in your reflections upon the *diſſenters*.

METHINKS you more than once diſcover a great tenderneſs to the *papiſts*. They ſeem to paſs for an harmleſs ſort of people, of which we have had no great occaſion to be apprehenſive; at leaſt of late. You are by no means for charging them with the burning of *London* in 1666, tho' they have generally born the blame of it; and tho' that part of the inſcription upon the monument which was cut out in the reign of K. *James*, and reſtor'd after the *Revolution*, (of which you did not think fit to take any notice,) charges it home upon them. But you are for ſuſpecting *French Hugonots*, and *Dutch* and *Engliſh Republicans* rather than the *Papiſts*, tho' they were evidently prov'd the authors and inſtruments, by a great many depoſitions that were taken by the order and authority of Parliament in 1667, and afterwards printed. You tell us very gravely, "That after weighing of all circum- "ſtances, we can ſtill make no exact deter- "mination: And are for judging on the cha- "ritable ſide." This is extremely mild and "gentle, I confeſs! and would almoſt tempt

Vol. III. p. 167.

Vol. III. p. 168.

a man to think you had no gall in you. So alſo, when they that were executed for the popiſh plot, pleaded their innocence, in ſolemn ſpeeches, back'd with ſtrong aſſeverations, you ſeem concern'd that they were not believ'd. Thus having ſaid, That *Langhorn*, (who was executed ſome time after the five Jeſuits, *Whitebread*, *Harcourt*, *Fenwick*, *Gawen* and *Turner*) "perſiſted in the moſt ſolemn, "poſitive and ſtrong expreſſions of his inno- "cence, which he had written down in a pa- "per, and deliver'd to the ſheriff; (you add "theſe Words) but all that he or others could "ſay, would gain no credit at this time; it "being a general belief, that they thought it "lawful, to utter the greateſt falſhoods and "lyes, in favour of their religion and cauſe." Which is a plain intimation, you thought that they might have been believ'd at another time; and that they had hard uſage, and met with ſuch treatment as they did not deſerve. Had you been alike favourable to all, who differ from you in their Sentiments, this would have deſerved the leſs notice.

Ib. p. 558.

You tell us indeed, That you have "care- "fully endeavour'd neither to exaſperate or "flatter any one party of men in the nation; "and that you have induſtriouſly avoided "all expreſſions either way. It is ſtrange that many things, that at firſt view don't appear very agreeable to ſuch a declaration, ſhould have eſcaped you, after all your *careful endeavours*. As to your *flattering* the diſſenters, I can eaſily acquit you: But whether there are not ſome things a little *exaſperating*, may deſerve your ſecond thoughts.

Pref. to Vol. I.

You acknowledge, "That the *Preſbyte-* "*rians* had a very conſiderable hand in the "Re-

Vol. III. p. 6.

" Reſtoration:" In owning of which you have done 'em a piece of juſtice, which ſome others have deny'd them. Being ſo ſerviceable at that juncture, might they not have expected other treatment than they afterwatds met with? I don't perceive you are free to go that farther ſtep. You rather ſeem afraid, leſt they ſhould hereupon over-value themſelves, or be over-valu'd by others, upon the account of their merit from the government: And therefore preſently declare, " that it was " only to relieve themſelves from the oppreſ- " ſions of the independents." But I don't know they would have had any more cauſe to expect that, by reſtoring King *Charles*, than either by continuing *Richard* as Protector, or by ſetting up General *Monk*. And therefore this is no true account of the matter: Nor is it ingenuous and candid. Should the diſſenters take the freedom to reflect on the leading men of your Church, whoſe carriage towards them at the latter end of the reign of King *James* II. was ſo different from what it had been before, and ſay, that the kindneſs and tenderneſs which they then diſcover'd, was not out of any true reſpect to them, but only owing to their fear of being ruin'd by the papiſts; I believe you'd be apt to count it diſingenuous, and it would bid fair for raiſing your reſentment: And yet I confeſs I can't ſee, but they would have as much reaſon for a cenſure of this nature, as you can pretend for your reflection.

You afterwards tell us, " That when the " diſputants at the *Savoy* conference, charged " eight things in the common prayer book " as flatly ſinful, and contrary to the word " of God, they either begg'd the queſtion, Ib. p. 49.

or fail'd in the proof." You have this objection from the author of the *Complete History of England:* And I thought I had made a sufficient return to it. 'Twas upon occasion of Dr. *Cosins*'s paper, that the Ministers brought this charge. That paper made a motion that they should *distinguish between the things which they charg'd as sinful*, (*i. e.* which they apprehended or judg'd sinful, and would undertake to prove to be sinful, if they were put to it) and *those which they oppos'd as inexpedient only*. Now in compliance with this motion, the Ministers mention'd eight things, which they charg'd as sinful, and were ready to prove such, if they were put to it. In such a case as this, it seems impertinent to pretend that they either begg'd the question, or fail'd in the proof: For any man that is not dispos'd and resolv'd to find fault with them, may see with half an eye, that they did neither. They did not *beg the question*; they only gave their judgment, which they might certainly be allow'd to do when it was call'd for. They did not *fail in the proof*; for that was yet to come. 'Twas enough that they were ready to give the proof, when it was call'd for. But to suppose they apprehend that their affirmation would go for proof, is to make them ridiculous; tho' without the least ground or occasion. As for what you add, that in the fifth, and sixth particulars, they went upon a supposition evidently false, I refer you to my answer in the *Abridgment*, in the place fore-cited.

Vol. III. p. 295. Abridg. Vol. I. p. 165.

You farther in the year 166$\frac{2}{3}$ give it as your judgment, "That had the presbyterian Ministers lost all dependance upon a "court

Vol. III. p. 97.

" court intereſt, and had they found the " King and the Miniſtry as intent upon the " obſervance of the *Act of Uniformity*, as " the commons of *England*, moſt of the ſo- " ber ſort would in all probability have been " brought over, and ſo added great ſtrength " and glory to the church and nation." That the presbyterian Miniſters, both then and afterwards *depended upon a court intereſt* more than they had any juſt ground for, I believe to be very true: But that rigour and ſeverity in inforcing the *Act of Uniformity*, would have gain'd them, is a thing in which I cannot by any means agree with you. If indeed the expedients which the King himſelf propos'd in his *Declaration* had been ſtood to, and confirm'd by law, I am very inclinable to be of Biſhop *Burnet*'s opinion, " that of the " two thouſand Miniſters that were turn'd " out, above one thouſand ſeven hundred " would have ſtaid in:" But that the ſtricteſt proſecution of that act, would have brought any number over, I cannot imagine. Whatever King *Charles* was at that time, both he and his Miniſtry, were ſufficiently intent upon the obſervation of that act afterwards; but I can't perceive that it was with any great ſucceſs. I don't find that more were brought to conformity afterwards than before. It is now towards 30 years that we have had our legal indulgence: And I'm ſatisfy'd it will be found upon a computation, that above double the number have gone over from the diſſenters to your church ſince that time, than ever were prevail'd with before: Which does not ſo well agree with your ſuppoſition. But after all, to me it appears a little ſtrange, that the *ſtrength and glory of the*

See his Reflections on a Pamphlet entituled, *Parliamentum Pacificum.*

the Church ſhould upon all occaſions be repreſented as depending ſo much upon our being *brought over* to you. I ſhould think it depends much more upon your making your Foundations wider, and taking away things offenſive. Tho' Biſhop *Wilkins*'s ſimilitude was but homely, yet I take it to be very inſtructive; when he told the Biſhop of *Durham*, that he thought he was more for the ſtrength and ſtability of the church than himſelf. For ſaid he, "you are for a church, like a top ſet "upon the piqued end, which can't be kept "up without whipping: But I am for a "church, that might be like a top, ſet with "the broad end downwards, which would be "able to ſtand of itſelf." To my mind nothing could ſo much contribute to the ſtrength and glory of the church, as the method He declar'd for.

Upon occaſion of the five mile act in 1665, you ſay, "it has been a general obſerva- "tion, that whatſoever hardſhips the diſſen- "ters met with from the laws, they aroſe "more from the ſeditious practices of ſome "of them, than the religious practices of any "of them." Which is a reflection that has nothing in it; and it might eaſily be retorted. Nothing can ſave thoſe from being charg'd with ſedition, that are determin'd to be run down by Miniſters of State. The greateſt innocence in ſuch a caſe is no fence. "The "correſpondence of ſome of them with the "enemy, was too notorious to be deny'd." As if the correſponding of a handful of the remains of the old army officers with the *Dutch*, would juſtify our Parliament, in paſſing a law which tended to reduce a number of miniſters and their families to want and beggary.

Vol. III. pag 150.

You

You add, " and even the more moderate, " shew'd a manifest disinclination to the war " against the *Dutch.*" This I believe true; but wonder you should call this *seditious:* For by the same rule, every thing that was against *French* counsels, must be so too. " When this " parliament was rous'd by the information " of the Chancellor, they thought they could " do no less than lay a new restraint upon " 'em, by this call'd the *five mile act.*" So that the whole of the matter is this; The Chancellor thought it for his interest to inveigh against the dissenters as seditious, and therefore they must be treated as if they deserv'd not to live in the same common air with their neighbours, and so roughly handled, that they might be reduc'd. But it should withall be remembred, that this very Chancellour in the apology which he left behind him when he fled into *France*, owns that after this session of parliament, his credit visibly declin'd.

This reflection also such as it is, might easily be retorted; and Bishop *Burnet* has shewn us the way; who tells us, " That when a " session of Parliament came, and the King " wanted money, then a new severe law " against the dissenters was offer'd to the an- " gry men of the church party, as the price " of it; and this seldom fail'd to have its ef- " fect: So that they were like the *jewels of* " *the crown*, pawn'd, when the King needed " money, but redeem'd at the next proroga- " tion.

See his Reflections on a Pamphlet entituled, *Parliamentum Pacificum.*

In 1669, there was a treaty with the Lord Keeper *Bridgman* about a comprehension. Upon which occasion you tell us, " That a " warm writer who appear'd in 1706, assures " us,

Vol. III. pag. 237.

" us, That the diſſenters in every meeting " making freſh demands, the Lord-Keeper " and others grew weary, and deſpair'd of " fixing them even to their own conceſſions: " So that Sir *John Barber* finding nothing but " tervigerſation and cavils, without any pro- " ſpect of a reaſonable compliance, gave " them over for a company of whiffling fel- " lows, and could not believe there was any " thing of conſcience in all their pretences: " And that Dr. *Burton* alſo, as fond and for- " ward as he was at firſt in that affair, at laſt " gave a like account; and as much deſpair'd " of ever bringing them to reaſon.". Tho' this is but a citation, yet you ſeem to produce it with no little pleaſure, and as what may be rely'd on: Which does not look as if you ſo *induſtriouſly avoided all expreſſions that had a tendency to exaſperate*, as you ſeem willing we ſhould believe you to have done. This is a home ſtroke: And a branding the poor diſſenters to all poſterity, as much as is in your power as an hiſtorian. But without enquiring into the truth of this report, (which I think may be juſtly queſtion'd) there is very good evidence that theſe diſſenters were not ſuch unreaſonable and unaccountable men as you'd willingly have them paſs for; ſince they were ſo ready, both before this treaty, and at the time of it, as well as afterwards, to have acquieſc'd in King *Charles*'s declaration for eccleſiaſtical affairs, which you yourſelf ſo much commend. This would have giv'n 'em general contentment: and their readineſs to take up with it, is a better evidence of their willingneſs to be ſatisfy'd with what was reaſonable, than any you bring that they poſitively inſiſted upon any thing farther.

But

But the truth of it was, The Court had no inclination to give 'em ſatisfaction. And therefore inſtead of any lenity, after the talk of a *Comprehenſion*, farther ſeverities were us'd toward 'em: and it is no difficult matter to judge, what ends were deſign'd to be thereby ſerv'd. And you ſeem to be well enough pleas'd that it was ſo; tho' I am apt to think you'd have reckon'd the uſage hard, had the caſe been your own.

You go on with your complaints, and tell us that "their meetings were full and fre- Pag. 238.
"quent, and they gradually aſſum'd a liberty "that became very offenſive to thoſe who "were by conſcience in the communion of "the church of *England*." The offence good Sir, was taken, and not given. "To make "themſelves a more formidable body againſt "the church, the two chief parties the preſ-"byterians and independents, formerly great "enemies to each other, were now project-"ing an union and coalition." But had you acted upon St. *Paul*'s maxim, That *Charity thinketh no ill*; I can't ſee how this attempt to lay aſide mutual animoſity, could have been any offence to you. And then you tell us, "That under this diſpoſition and confi-"dence, the whole body of the diſſenters "appear'd ſo open intrampling upon the laws "and conſtitution, that it juſtly rais'd not "only the indignation of the churchmen, "but the jealouſies of all who were honeſtly "concern'd for the government, and the "legal adminiſtration of it." Which tho' an heavy charge, has not as far as I can perceive, any evidence to ſupport it. All that the diſſenters did, was to meet together to worſhip GOD, according to their conſciences,

with doors open, and prohibiting none that were willing to joyn themſelves to them. I can't ſee how this could *raiſe the indignation of the churchmen*, unleſs they would have none worſhip GOD but themſelves, or not worſhip Him at all, unleſs they did it in that way, that they thought fit to appoint 'em. And how ſhould this affect the *Government*, or give any *jealouſy* to the true friends of it, when none were more zealous for the *legal adminiſtration of it* than they, who are only charg'd with *trampling on the Laws and conſtitution*, becauſe they would not ſubject their conſciences, to the pleaſure of others, in things in which GOD had left them full liberty, to judge and chooſe for themſelves? If their enemies in the mean time were *honeſtly concern'd for the government, and the legal adminiſtration of it*; they took but an odd way to ſhew it, by ſacrificing liberty and property to the prerogative; and courting that arbitrary power, which threatn'd to ſwallow up every thing that was valuable to free-born *Engliſhmen*. It here deſerves a remark, that we were no ſooner beginning to recover out of our lethargy, than the houſe of commons, who appear'd to be as *honeſtly concern'd for the government, and the legal adminiſtration of it*, as any men whatſoever, freely voted, "The proſecution of proteſtant diſ-
Jan. 10. 1680. "ſenters upon the penal laws, grievous to "the ſubjects, a weakening the proteſtant "intereſt, and an encouragement to popery, "and dangerous to the peace of the king-"dom."

UPON the diſſolution of the long penſionary parliament, (and I believe it will continue ſtill counted and call'd ſo, notwithſtanding

ing what you have offer'd from the Duke of *Leeds* by way of excuſe) you again run upon the diſſenters, and tell us, " That moſt of " them were tranſported at the diſſolution, " and they and their friends exerted them- " ſelves in the elections after an extraordi- " nary manner, having a hopeful proſpect " of a new ſtruggle, either of a ſuperiority, " or an equal eſtabliſhment." Which is ſo grating a reflection, that I ſhould have tho't it a little *exaſperating*, had you not given ſuch a poſitive aſſurance, That *you have induſtriouſly avoided all expreſſions that had a tendency that way.* I ſhall here in return, give you the words of Mr. *John Howe*, which I think are much to the purpoſe: " Nor, ſays he, can " any malice deny, or ignorance of obſerving " *Engliſh* men overlook this plain matter of " fact. After the diſſolution of that parlia- " ment, diſſenters were much careſs'd, and " endeavour'd to be drawn into a ſubſervi- " ency to the court deſigns, eſpecially in " the elections of after parliaments. Notwith- " ſtanding which, they every-where ſo en- " tirely and unanimouſly fell in with the " ſober part of the nation, in the choice " of ſuch perſons for the three parliaments " that next ſucceeded, (two held at *Weſtmin- " ſter*, and that at *Oxford*) as it was known " would, and who did moſt generouſly aſſert " the liberties of the nation, and the prote- " ſtant religion. Which alone, (and not our " meer diſſent from the church of *England* " in matters of religion, wherein *Charles* II. " was ſufficiently known to be a Prince of " great indifferency) drew upon us, ſoon " after the diſſolution of the laſt of thoſe " parliaments, the dreadful ſtorm of perſecu-

Vol. III. pag. 512.

See his Caſe of *proteſtant Diſſenters* repreſented and argu'd in 1689, which is inſerted in my *Abridgm.* Vol. I. p. 429, *&c.*

" tion, that deſtroy'd not a ſmall number of " lives in jayls, and ruin'd multitudes of fa- " milies." So that you ſee, that as to the main of what you charge here upon us, it is the matter of our glorying; only the proſpect was different. The proſpect of the diſſenters was only to have *the liberties of the nation, and the proteſtant religion aſſerted*; and this you turn into *an hopeful proſpect of a new ſtruggle, either for a ſuperiority, or an equal eſtabliſhment.* And if the diſſenters had thought this *proſpect hopeful*, they muſt have been as weak and ſenſeleſs as you can imagine or repreſent them. But I muſt own, that for my life I can't gueſs with whom this hopeful ſtruggle was to be, whether with King or Parliament; nor over whom they expected to get ſuperiority, whether Church or State. The truth of it is, a charge of this nature is a meer jeſt! The diſſenters neither then nor ſince, deſir'd any more than to be treated as Chriſtians, and *Engliſhmen*; and be left in the poſſeſſion of all the rights of each, in common with their neighbours. And it is a ſign, that neither their expectations, hopes, nor proſpects, were rais'd very high, in that they were ſo well pleas'd, as to themſelves, with getting at laſt a vote paſs'd againſt the *proſecution* of them *upon the penal laws*, which I but now mention'd: Which yet in the iſſue prov'd inſufficient to ſcreen them from great ſeverities.

Vol. III. pag. 721. At length, you tell us, " That had the " reign of King *Charles* II. continu'd a " while longer in the courſe 'twas in, as it " had been the riſe, ſo probably it had been " the ruin of all meeting-houſes." You gather this from hence, " That the diſſenters " were

" were reduc'd to the loweſt ebb; and in " moſt great towns and corporations the " greateſt part of them went regularly to " church, eſpecially the leſs rigid, and " younger ſort; and the city of *London* alſo " was reduc'd, *&c.* But why ſhould the *meeting-houſes*, good Sir, be ſuch an offence to you? Why ſhould you reckon it ſo great and ſo deſirable a thing to triumph over them? Had your deſire been compaſs'd, there would have been no acceſſion either to real religion, or the common liberty. And I muſt confeſs, I am not without fear, that had King *Charles*'s reign continu'd a little longer, the whole body of the nation would have become both papiſts and ſlaves; and the *Church of England*, might have been glad of meeting-houſes for proteſtant worſhip, without moleſtation.

But you han't yet done with the diſſenters: You renew your charges againſt them in the reign of King *James*, and tell us, " That upon that Prince's publiſhing his de- " claration for liberty of conſcience, (which open'd thoſe formidable meeting-houſes that were before kept ſhut) " the diſſenters were Vol. III. " ſo tranſported, that they caught greedi- pag. 817. " ly at the bait, without the leaſt diſcern- " ing the hook in it. They were not " contented with a ſilent acceptance of the " liberty, but were drawn in to make inſults " of joy for it, and preſented addreſſes of " thanks ſo high and extravagant, that ſome " of them were thought offenſive to the ve- " ry ears of the King." But ſuppoſe, (as Biſhop *Burnet* in his reflections on the firſt declaration for liberty of conſcience, reckons before-hand to be very poſſible) they ſhould ſome of them have been " under a temptati-

" on,

Ib. p. 818.

" on, to receive what gave 'em preſent eaſe, " with a little too much kindneſs, methinks " it might have been conſider'd, that they lay " expos'd to a great many ſevere laws, of " which they had felt the weight very heavi- " ly, which requires ſome allowance." You have recited my reply to this objection at large, and without a return to it, have by way of ballance, given *the hiſtorical account* of an *oppoſite author*, and then left the reader to his own judgment. And I can do the ſame, as freely as you, only adding, That if he'll be at the pains to conſult the author cited in the margin, upon this head, I can hardly think he'll remain unſatisfy'd *.

*Mr. *Tong*'s Brief hiſtorical Account of Nonconformity; at the End of his Defence of Mr. *M.H*'s brief Enquiry into the nature of Schiſm, &c. p. 153.

Vol. III. p. 875.

You afterwards ſeem a little better pleas'd with the diſſenters, and tell us, " That the " more moderate ſort of them, were ſo " fully ſatisfy'd with that ſtand which the " *London* Divines had made againſt popery, " and the unanſwerable treatiſes they had " writ againſt it, that they ſhew'd an unuſual " readineſs to come in to them." If by this you mean a coming in to their aſſiſtance againſt popery, which was breaking in upon the nation like a flood, and therefore call'd for a conjunction of all hearts and hands to oppoſe it by *reſiſtance*, 'tis very true: But if by *coming in to them*, you mean joyning in with them, in approving of impoſitions, or owning the authority of any to impoſe in things uncommanded in ſcripture, or inforc'd by no circumſtantial neceſſity or expedience, you widely miſtake, and miſrepreſent 'em. The truth of it is, The danger of the Church, inclining thoſe who had formerly been very rigorous and ſevere, to declare, they were willing to come to a temper, and for the future

future uſe thoſe as brethren, whom they had born ſo hard on before, they alſo in return, ſhew'd a forgiving ſpirit, and a readineſs heartily to joyn in with them in any meaſures that were neceſſary to the common ſafety. But when after the *Revolution* was over, the buſineſs of a *Comprehenſion* and an *Indulgence* came to be debated in the two houſes of parliament, and many of the churchmen were ſo cold and ſhy, and diſcover'd ſuch a willingneſs to forget their promiſes in the time of their diſtreſs, and ſtill to keep the diſſenters under an undeſerved brand, this appear'd to them ſo diſingenuous, that it is not at all to be wonder'd at if it diſcourag'd 'em from having any farther expectations from 'em; and induc'd them to depend wholly upon the juſtice of their cauſe, and the providence of GOD, which notwithſtanding the unkind treatment they have met with ſince, (in which 'tis needleſs for me to be particular) they don't ſee any occaſion to repent of, to this day.

UPON the whole; tho' I'm as ready to grant, as you to deſire it, "that it is a miſe- Pref. to
"rable miſtake to charge a perſon with par- Vol. II.
"tiality, only becauſe he determines on one "ſide," when he's well aſſur'd, that that one ſide is right; yet when it ſo much becomes all (and eſpecially clergymen) to do as they would be done by; whether you have follow'd this rule, and would not think you were hardly dealt with, if others ſhould meet to you with the ſame meaſure that you have met to the diſſenters, I leave it to your own conſideration; provided you'll but allow one thing, (than which I know nothing more reaſonable) that the diſſenters have as much right

to

to differ from you, as you from them, which they who treat 'em as you have done, are too apt to forget.

BUT there is yet another thing that is ſo remarkable in your performance, that it by no means ſhould be paſs'd by: And that is, the freedom you have taken with the characters of a variety of perſons of figure and reputation in the times they ſeverally liv'd in. I am very ſenſible, "that proper characters "of men give life, as well as add inſtruction "to hiſtory:" and ſhall not ſcruple to own it my opinion, that notwithſtanding my Lord *Clarendon* is ſometimes ſevere enough, yet the characters he has given of thoſe who were upon the ſtage of action in the time he writes of, is none of the leaſt beautiful parts of his hiſtory. But I am far from thinking that you are herein equally happy.

Pref. to Vol. I.

AS to the great men of the *Scotiſh* nation, it's a very rare thing for you to have a good word for any of 'em. You not only give ill characters of the D. of *Hamilton*, whom you ſtile *unfaithful*; and the Earl of *Traquair*, who you ſay, was accounted by Sir *Philip Warwick* a *verſatile man, and by others worſe*; the Earl of *Rothes*, whom you repreſent *as one of the firſt and moſt active inſtruments in the troubles and commotions* in the reign of K. *Charles* I; and who, you afterwards tell us, (from Archbp. *Laud*) *made a baſe and diſhonourable end, in rottenneſs and a ſcandalous diſtemper*, tho' *his friends conceal'd it as much as they could*: And the Marquiſs of *Argyle*, who you ſay, *was thought to have the blood of ſeveral lying heavy upon his head*: But I am not able to recollect ſo much as one nobleman or gentleman from the *North*, except the Marquiſs of *Montroſs*, that

Vol. II. p. 258, 259.

Ib. p. 159.

Ib. p. 104.

Vol. III. p. 64.

that you have a good word for. This looks ſo like a national grudge or antipathy, as I doubt will hardly recommend either your judgment, or your impartiality. But here I muſt leave you to the *Scots*, who are beſt able to make a particular reply, on the behalf of their own countrymen.

HOWEVER, it is plain, you are very free with the characters of many *Engliſh* as well as *Scotiſh* men. You ſeem to me to bear a little too hard on an eminent prelate of your own church: I mean Archbiſhop *Abbot*, who you ſay, "had a tincture of too little reſpect "towards thoſe who had the immediate cure "of ſouls; and generally favour'd the laity a- "bove the clergy, in all caſes brought before "him: And add, that his temper was ſour'd "againſt the high party, by age and hard- "ſhips." But I never find him charg'd with invading either liberty or property, which is more than can be ſaid of one that came after him, whom you highly extol. Vol. II. p. 16.

THE reflections which you make on the family of the famous *John Hambden*, Eſq; (whom after my Lord *Clarendon* you deſervedly repreſent as ſo great a man) is very unaccountable. To me I confeſs it appears a little hard, that this family which is as eminent for its antiquity and its reputation, as any among our gentry, ſhould from time to time be with ſo much freedom reflected on by the writers of our hiſtory, as under the judgments of providence, which thoſe that underſtand themſelves the beſt, are commonly the leaſt free with. My Lord *Clarendon* takes notice, "That his fate violently carry'd him "to pay the mulct by his death, in the very "place where a year before he had commit- "ted his tranſgreſſion, in executing the ordi- Hiſt. of the Rebell. &c. Vol. III. Book vii. p. 264, &c.

" nance of the *Militia*, and ingaging the " county, (in which his reputation was ſo " very great) in rebellion." And now come you, and intimate, that the judgments of God follow'd his poſterity. For you tell us, " That he left only two ſons behind him, one " a cripple, and the other ſomewhat like a " lunatick, as *Sanderſon* tells us; and a train of " misfortunes ſeem'd to have been entail'd on " the family." I can't imagine why you ſhould quote *Sanderſon* about this gentleman's two ſons, or what end you could propoſe to ſerve by it. I ſuppoſe you would have forborn it, had you been aware that ſuch an author as Dr. *Heylin*, who wrote animadverſions upon *Sanderſon*, had long ſince taken him to task for that very paſſage. I ſuppoſe you will not ſcruple to own that Dr. *Heylin*, is a very good author. Now it ſo happens, that he taking notice of what *Sanderſon* had ſaid about this very matter, expreſſes himſelf thus: " On " what grounds he ſpeaks this, as I do not " know, ſo neither is it worth enquiry. And " tho' I might leave the children of Mr. " *Hampden* under this reproach, as an un- " doubted ſign of God's judgments on him, " for being a principal incendiary in that fire " which for a long time conſum'd the king- " dom; yet ſo far do I prefer truth before " private intereſt, that I ſhall do him that " right in his poſterity, which our author, " either out of ignorance, eaſineſs of belief, " or malice, hath been pleas'd to deny him. " And therefore the reader is to know, That " the ſurviving children of that gentleman, " are not only of an exact and comely ſta- " ture, but that they have in them all the " abilities of wit and judgment, wherewith " their father was endu'd, *&c.*" Since that time,

Vol. II. p. 414.

See Dr. *Heylin*'s Advertiſ. on the Hiſt. of the reign of King *Charles* I. p. 151.

time, one of theſe two ſons has made a conſiderable figure in the world, and been a leading member in ſeveral houſes of Commons, and particularly, in the Convention-parliament, where he argu'd ſtrenuouſly for the *Abdication*, and the Settlement of the Crown upon King *William*; in which, I hope, it won't be thought he acted either like a lunatick or a cripple. He was afterwards *Chancellour of the Exchequer* for many years, in which ſtation, as well as in the houſe of Commons and Privy-council, he acquitted himſelf ſo as to leave behind him the reputation of a Gentleman of excellent good ſenſe, and always in the intereſt of his country. And as for the *train of misfortunes intail'd on his family*, ſuppoſe it really was ſo, I don't ſee what of an argument could be drawn from thence, as to the juſtneſs or exceptionableneſs of principles either religious or political. If I ſhould mention ſome families that flouriſh'd before the civil war, in which they joyn'd with the King's party, and have ſince declin'd; or that before were numerous, and have ſince been in danger of being extinct, or actually are extinct, (which might be no difficult matter) I believe you'd think it hard for me to repreſent ſuch things, either as judgments of GOD, or as a proof that the parties concern'd were in the wrong. And if the argument won't hold on one ſide, it can have no force on the other. But however, when you mention'd *the train of misfortunes that ſeem'd to have been entail'd on this* honourable *family*, you ſhould have done well to have remember'd, that a great grandſon of the ſame gentleman is now in being; who as he has in his poſſeſſion the ancient ſeat and eſtate of the family, ſo has alſo been knight of the ſhire for the ſame county as

his family has ſo long flouriſh'd in, in ſeveral parliaments; and was not only a manager in the trial of my Lord of *Oxford*, but is chair-man of the Committee of elections in this very parliament, and a privy-councellor to his Majeſty King GEORGE, and Treaſurer of the Navy. I hope you don't rank theſe among *misfortunes*. Whereas therefore you tell us, "That upon reaſona-
Pref. to Vol. II. p. 7. "ble proof of miſtake, you ſhall be ſo far "from being tenacious, in the wrong no-"tions of honour and humour, that you "ſhall moſt readily and publickly recant, "and retract:" You muſt allow me to tell you, That ſeveral branches and relations of this antient family, that has kept its reputation through ſo many ages, expect you ſhould perform your promiſe in their caſe, where the miſtake is ſo evident and groſs, and ſo incapable of any thing like an excuſe.

AND what a character do you give of the great and good Lord *Ruſſel*, of whom an eminent perſon truly ſaid, "that an Age would "not repair the loſs to the nation!" He paſt through and left this world with as great and general a reputation as any one of the age. And in the preamble to the patent by which his noble father was created a Duke, their Majeſties King *William* and Queen *Mary*, among other Reaſons for beſtowing this Honour, give this as not the leaſt, that the E. was father to the Lord *RUSSEL*, the orna-"ment of his age, whoſe great merits 'twas "not enough to tranſmit by hiſtory to po-"ſterity, but they were willing to record "them in their royal patent, to remain in "the family as a Monument conſecrated to "his conſummate Vertue, whoſe name could

"never

" never be forgot, ſo long as Men preſer-
" ved any eſteem for ſanctity of manners,
" greatneſs of mind, and a love to their
" country, conſtant even to death. To ſo-
" lace therefore his excellent father for ſo
" great a loſs, to celebrate the memory of
" ſo noble a Son, and to excite his worthy
" Grandſon, the heir of ſuch mighty hopes,
" more chearfully to emulate and follow
" the example of his illuſtrious father, they
" entail'd this high dignity upon the Earl
" and his poſterity, *&c.*" And yet you, Sir, ſpeaking of this excellent perſon my Lord *William Ruſſel*, (whoſe name ſhould never be mention'd by Engliſhmen without ſingular reſpect) expreſs your ſelf thus: " That whatever may be ſaid in favour of Vol. III.
" his ſtanding up for the liberties of his p. 694.
" country, he can hardly be clear'd from
" thirſting after the blood of others, eſpe-
" cially the Lord *Stafford*, &c." I profeſs I'm heartily ſorry there is ſuch a paſſage to be found in your hiſtory. I remember indeed you give your readers warning in one of your prefaces, " That you have taken the liber- Pref. to
" ty occaſionally to ſtigmatize ſome things Vol. I.
" wherever you found them, and particular-
" ly an inſatiable thirſt after the blood of
" others:" But I believe few could imagine that my Lord *Ruſſel* was one of the inſtances, whom you intended to brand to all poſterity. I am afraid you yourſelf will this way become a greater ſufferer than he. In the paper which that Lord left as a legacy to the world, there are theſe remarkable words: " I thank God falſhood and cruelty were
" never in my nature, but always the far-
" theſt from it imaginable." Tho' he was of ſuch known integrity in the courſe of his life,

life, yet you this way repreſent him as dying with a lie in his mouth, which is an heavy charge. And your proof is as weak, as your charge is unmerciful. It is no other than this; that *his Zeal* againſt the Lord *Stafford* " tranſported him ſo far, that he " was one of thoſe who with *Bethel*, *Corniſh*, " &c. queſtion'd the King's power in allow- " ing that Lord to be only beheaded." But how that proves him *a thirſter after the blood of others*, I can't imagine; any more than how an owning the King's power to allow that Lord to be beheaded, prov'd thoſe who were on the other ſide, to be merciful, and no lovers of ſpilling blood. And yet this is a thing you are ſo fond of, that we have it again in the caſe of Alderman *Corniſh*, who you ſay was *ſo zealous in the caſe of the Lord* Stafford, " That being Sheriff at " that time, he was unwilling to allow him " the common favour ſhewn to the nobility " of being beheaded." But this referr'd not ſo properly to the ſhedding of blood, as to the way and manner of it. I always hitherto reckon'd the *thirſting after blood*, to intimate a deſire of its being ſpilt without juſt cauſe. And if we underſtand it otherwiſe, I don't ſee how judge and jury, ſheriff and executioner, can be excus'd from *thirſting after blood*, when they are for diſpatching one that has been prov'd guilty of a capital crime, in one way or another. Now this was the caſe with reſpect both to the Lord *Ruſſel*, and Mr. *Corniſh*: They thought the Lord *Stafford* was fully prov'd guilty of the treaſon he was charg'd with; and therefore that it was but fitting he ſhould be executed for the deterring of others. There was ſomething of a debate about the manner of execution, but no

Vol. III. p. 779.

cruelty

cruelty or thirſting after blood, as I can perceive, in the one or the other. But when you intimate, " That the court was under " ſome neceſſity of bringing the Lord *Ruſſel* " to deſtruction, " you charge cruelty and thirſting after blood, home upon the court. And methinks a court that is own'd to be *under a neceſſity of bringing any man to deſtruction, for his worth and probity*, ſhould not be pleaded for by an Archdeacon of the Church; nor indeed by any man that values either ſobriety, or the common ſafety. Having made ſo punctual a promiſe, " to correct and amend " whatever is found to be amiſs, " I beſeech you, Sir, when you put that promiſe in practice, let not ſuch things as theſe be overlook'd.

Vol. III. p. 685.

Pref. to Vol. III.

AMONG others whom you have branded in the courſe of your hiſtory, I cannot omit Sir *George Treby*, who acquitted himſelf with ſo much honour, and approv'd himſelf ſuch a lover of his country, both when he acted as recorder of *London*, and one of the ſecret-committee of the houſe of Commons againſt the popiſh conſpirators in the reign of King *Charles* II, and alſo upon the bench, as *Lord Chief Juſtice of the Common-pleas*, in the reign of King *William*. Few gentlemen of the long robe have left a greater name behind them than he has done; and I am ſorry that you ſhould attempt to rob him of it, by telling the world, That he and Sir *Robert Clayton* together, being with *Fitzharris* in *Newgate*, Sir *George* ſwore, *God's wounds*, and ſaid to him, *What were you ever but a rogue?* The latter indeed is not at all unlikely: But as for the former, I have made ſtrict enquiry, and cannot perceive there is the leaſt foundation for it. For ſeveral of my Lord chief juſtice

Vol. III. pag. 615.

Treby's

Treby's own family, and others that knew him intimately, declare, That they never knew him uſe any oaths in diſcourſe: And all agree he could never uſe ſuch words; and that therefore he is groſly abus'd. I have been told by a friend of mine, that meeting a gentleman of the long robe at a bookſeller's ſhop in *Weſtminſter-Hall*, where your ſecond and third volumes lay upon the counter, the gentleman ask'd him, Whether he had read 'em? And he anſwering in the negative, and asking the gentleman (who own'd that he had taken the pains to read 'em) his thoughts concerning them, he reply'd, *Indeed, Sir, this is a vile book! for it has branded as honeſt a gentleman as any in the age;* and he turn'd him to this paſſage concerning Sir *George Treby*, at which they were both amaz'd. I mention this, that you may make your uſe of it, and be ſenſible, how much you have expos'd your ſelf by the freedom you have taken in your characters of perſons, in whom the world think themſelves not a little concern'd, becauſe of their worth and eminence.

Vol. III. pag. 467.

I am alſo ſurpriz'd you ſhould repreſent Sir *Edmund Bury Godfrey*, (of whom we have heard ſo much before) as a *favourer, rather than a proſecutor of the papiſts;* which is an account of him I don't find given by any one but your ſelf and *L'Eſtrange*: And your having him for your voucher, will afford you but little relief. That author indeed ſays, "That "this gentleman did many good offices to "known prieſts, when he found 'em in di-"ſtreſs, to the extreme hazard both of his "perſon and eſtate." That he might upon occaſion do them offices of humanity, I can eaſily believe: But that he ſo far lov'd 'em, as to expoſe himſelf out of kindneſs to them,

Brief Hiſtory of the times. Part II. p. 31. and Part III. p. 168.

is

s what I find contradicted by all that knew him. *L'Eſtrange*'s credit will go but a very little way, when put in the ballance with that of Sir *Edm. Bury Godfrey*. Methinks 'twas enough to have this worthy gentleman murder'd once: 'T is pity he ſhould be murder'd over and over again in his reputation. I ſhall in his vindication, only add, the character which Bp. *Lloy'd* (who might, as he himſelf intimated, well be allow'd *to know him better than moſt others*) gave of him in his funeral Sermon in theſe words. " Tho' (ſays the Bi- Funeral
" ſhop) the compaſſion that he had for all Serm. p. 13.
" men that did amiſs, extended itſelf to all
" manner of diſſenters; and among them
" he had a kindneſs for the perſons of ma-
" ny *Roman Catholicks*: Yet he always de-
" clar'd a particular hatred and deteſtation of
" popery:" Now 'tis hardly conſiſtent with his deteſtation of popery, for him to be ſuch a favourer of the Papiſts, as to ſerve them when in diſtreſs, to the extreme hazard both of his perſon and eſtate.

Such reflections as theſe upon perſons of known worth, (and I have but ſelected a few out of many,) you muſt allow me to be ſurpriz'd at: But you go yet farther, and reflect upon whole bodies of men, and condemn them in the lump, which is not fair or prudent. The giving general characters of nations, or any ſocieties of men, that are commonly made up of perſons as different in their capacities and inclinations, as in their faces, is, what I find by my obſervation, men of ſenſe reckon very exceptionable; and that not without reaſon: Becauſe where this method is taken, it is not to be avoided, but that may will be reckon'd to be what they are not in reality, and have ſeve-

ral things laid upon 'em with which they are not chargeable. But you reckon your ſelf it ſeems to have this licence, and make uſe of it in the caſe of the *Aſſembly of Divines*, who met at *Weſtminſter* ; and I don't know but you may think you might make the more free with them, becauſe they went under the denomination of *Divines*. As this *Aſſembly* was choſen out of all the Divines in the nation, by the members of Parliament, who themſelves differ'd not a little in their judgments, views and deſigns, ſo is it not to be wonder'd at, that the perſons choſen, ſhould be of different principles, and notions, and different in their improvements and abilities. However, after all the cenſures that have been paſs'd upon them, I dare offer them to be compar'd (for their intellectual and moral qualifications) with any convocation you can propoſe, either before the Reſtoration, or ſince.

Vol. II. p. 416. You tell us indeed that King *Charles* in his "Proclamation, by which he counter-"manded their meeting, charg'd the far "greater part of them with having no "learning or reputation." But what of that! you know very well, that ſuch proclamations are penned by others. And we may well queſtion how far King *Charles* was a judge either of their *learning or reputation*, who knew little of them but what he heard from others. We look upon a paſſage of that nature, only as a bold aſſertion of ſome of the King's Miniſters, that might be ill affected to all that were not zealous for epiſcopacy. You then add from the Lord *Clarendon*,

Ibid. "That ſome of them were infamous in their "lives and converſations, and moſt of them "of very mean parts in learning, if not of "ſcanda-

" ſcandalous ignorance, and of no other re-
" putation, than of malice to the Church of
" *England.*" But as great a man as the Earl of *Clarendon* was, this muſt paſs for down right calumny, till there be ſomething produc'd that looks like proof. Afterwards, you quote Mr. *Whitlock*, as ſaying that divers members of both Houſes gave their Votes with the Divines, in any matter in conſideration among them: In which debates (he ſays) Mr. *Selden* ſpake admirably, and confuted divers of them in their own learning; and ſometimes when they had cited a text of ſcripture to prove their aſſertion, he would tell them, perhaps in their little pocket bibles with gilt leaves, which they would often read, the tranſlation may be thus; but the *Greek* and the *Hebrew* ſignifies thus and thus; and would ſilence thoſe pretenders to Divinity. It's an eaſy thing to make a jeſt of a meeting of the greateſt men that can be got together upon any occaſion. If both Mr. *Whitlock* and Mr. *Selden*, ſhould have no very profound reſpect for Divines, 'tis not at all to be wonder'd at, conſidering their character. He that looks into *Selden*'s preface to his *Hiſtory of Tithes*, will find he could reflect with ſmartneſs upon the epiſcopal Clergy upon occaſion, as well as Divines of other Sentiments: For he there charges them with *ignorance* and *lazineſs*; and upbraids them with having nothing to keep up their credit, but *beard*, *habit*, and *title*; and intimates, that their ſtudies reach'd no farther, than the *Breviary*, the *Poſtils*, and the *Polyanthea*. So that if this Gentleman's either inſulting or bantering, was an argument of ignorance in thoſe he had to do with, the hierarchical Miniſters had no great cauſe of boaſting. The

Ib, p. 417.

truth of it is, tho' Mr. *Selden* was a great Scholar, yet he was no great friend to Miniſters of any ſort.

BUT as for the members of this aſſembly, you your ſelf have given ſuch characters of a good number of them, as ſhews that whatever might be thought of them either by King *Charles* or his courtiers, *Whitlock* or *Selden*, you look'd upon them neither as infamous nor ignorant.

THUS you own as to Dr. *Twiſſe* the Prolocutor, that he left the name of the moſt acute and ſubtle Divine of the age. And tell us that Mr. *John White* of *Dorcheſter* ſhew'd an excellent faculty in the clear and ſolid interpretation of the holy ſcriptures. Mr. *George Walker* was well skill'd in the oriental tongues, and noted for his diſputation with the Jeſuit *Fiſher*, and others of the Romiſh church, *&c.* Dr. *William Gouge*, was a learned and pious preacher highly eſteem'd by ſeveral foreign Divines. Mr. *Gataker* was remarkable for his skill in the *Greek* and *Hebrew* tongues; highly eſteem'd by *Salmaſius* and other foreigners: And 'tis hard to ſay which is moſt remarkable, his exemplary piety and charity, his polite literature, or his humility and modeſty in refuſing preferments. Dr. *John* (I think it ſhould be *Robert*) *Harris* you own had been ſo admirable a Grecian, and ſo celebrated a preacher, when in the Univerſity, that the famous Sir *Henry Savil* us'd frequently to ſay, that he was ſecond to St. *Chryſoſtom*. Mr. *John Ley* was a perſon well vers'd in various authors, and a moſt ready writer and preacher. Dr. *Cheynel* (who was perhaps one of as much warmth as any in all the company) your acknowledge to have been a man of conſiderable learning and great abilities. And as

Vol. II. p. 545.
Ib.. p. 624.
Ib. p7. 32.
Ib. p. 756.
Ib. p. 771.
Ib. p. 827.
Vol III. p. 94.
Ib. p. 154.

for

for my grandfather Mr. *Edmund Calamy*, (as much as you on other accounts reflect upon him) you own him to have been one of no ſmall learning. Dr. *Tuckney*, you ſay, left behind him the name of a perſon eminent for learning and piety, as well as humility and good temper. Mr. *Caryl* was a man of conſiderable parts and learning. Dr. *Lightfoot* diſtinguiſh'd himſelf by an inexhauſtible fund of rabbinical learning. And Dr. *Edward Reynolds*, left behind him the character of a man of excellent parts and endowments, of a very great wit, fancy, and judgment. The Divines that met in the Aſſembly were not full out an hundred in all. Of thirteen of theſe you have given ſuch characters, as clear them from ſcandalous ignorance: And you might have added twice thirteen more, of whom you might have given as good characters, as of thoſe you have mention'd: As, Mr. *Oliver Bowles*, Mr. *Arrowſmith*, Mr. *Stanley Gower*, Mr. *Richard Heyrick*, Dr. *Chambers*, Dr. *Seaman*, Dr. *Wilkinſon*, Mr. *Vines*, Dr. *Hoyle*, Mr. *Herle*, Mr. *Herbert Palmer*, Mr. *Daniel Cawdry*, and Dr. *Thomas Goodwin*, *&c.* And there were ſeveral of them that afterwards conform'd, and made a conſiderable figure in your church, whom I ſuppoſe, notwithſtanding what occurs in the King's proclamation, or in my Lord *Clarendon*, you would not be free to charge as perſons of *very mean parts in learning*, or *ſcandalous ignorance*: As Dr. *Conant*, Dr. *Wallis*, Mr. (afterwards Dr.) *Thomas Hodges*, Mr. *William Mew*, &c. But tho' you have omitted theſe, and many others of equal worth, yet in giving ſuch a character as you have done of thoſe you have mentioned, you have in effect confronted, and confuted the foregoing general cenſures given by

Vol. III. p. 178.
Ib. p. 264.
Ib. p. 308.
Ib. p. 401.
Ib. p. 407.

King

King *Charles*, my Lord *Clarendon*, Mr. *Whitlock*, and Mr. *Selden*. And I think verily, you ſhould have omitted either the one or the other: For if theſe men deſerv'd ſuch characters as thoſe you have given them, they were plainly ſlander'd in thoſe general cenſures: And if they deſerv'd thoſe cenſures, ſuch a commendation ſhould not have been given of them in your hiſtory.

But there are ſome of them upon whom you reflect particularly; and that with warmth and keenneſs enough. I ſhall here alſo follow you:

And ſhall begin with my honour'd grandfather, who, you ſay, "was ſo much an "incendiary and promoter of the grand re- "bellion, that his actions cannot be vindi- "cated, but only palliated, under the vene- "rable name of an houſe of Commons." Why, what is the matter, good Sir? He was no Chaplain in the army, he was no enemy to a liturgy, freed from paſſages liable to juſt objections; and was rather for reforming epiſcopacy according to Biſhop *Uſher*'s platform, than eradicating it; and he was a bitter enemy to all mobbs: And if he had a reſpect to the *Houſe of Commons* at their firſt ſetting out, and for a good while after, before they were ſo modell'd as no longer to be the repreſentatives of the Commons of *England*, he did but therein concur with all that part of the nation, that were unwilling to make a ſacrifice of the liberty of the ſubject, to the prerogative of the prince. Why then, muſt he be branded as an incendiary? All the reaſon that you give, is this, "That "the houſe of Commons either miſled him, or "were miſled by him; he being a frequent "preacher before them, and one of the au- "thors

Vol. III. pag. 178.

" thors of the celebrated *Smectymnuus*." That he preach'd before the houſe of Commons, is true : But not that he was a *frequent preacher before them*. I have look'd over the liſt of the preachers before this parliament, and can find but three ſermons he ever preach'd before the Commons, which (conſidering how many years they ſate) is hardly ſufficient to denominate him *a frequent preacher before them*. The firſt was on *Dec.* 22, 1641, when he preach'd on *Jer*, xviii. 7, 8, 9, 10 : The drift of which ſermon, is to ſhew, That national repentance will divert, and national ſins pull down, national judgments : And I hope, this could not miſlead them. The ſecond was, *Febr.* 23, 1641 ; at which time he preach'd upon *Ezek.* xxxvi. 32 : The aim of which ſermon was, to repreſent *England*'s mercies, as a motive and a means of *England*'s humiliation, and reformation. His third and laſt ſermon before them, was on *Octob.* 22, 1644, from *Acts* xvii. 30, upon the doctrine of repentance. If you yourſelf had taken the pains to read theſe plain practical ſermons, I hardly think you could have pretended to charge him with *miſleading the houſe of Commons*. For tho' there are ſome complaints intermingled, of ſeveral hardſhips which many worthy perſons met with before this Parliament, and motions made for farther rectifying things that were amiſs ; yet is there nothing tending to inflame or widen the differences between King and Parliament ; no puſhing them on to rigour and ſeverity ; no inclination diſcover'd to have the conſtitution alter'd, or any of our foundations overthrown. But his unpardonable fault was, that he was *one of the authors of the celebrated Smectymnuus :* And if that with the *Vindication* of it was warm, in oppoſition

to

to the divine original of epiſcopacy, and the neceſſity of ſtinted liturgies, I believe any man that reads Biſhop *Hall*'s defence of his remonſtrance, and his anſwer to the vindication, *&c.* will hardly think it at all falls ſhort of it. But ſuppoſe he had lanch'd out farther than could be ſtrictly juſtify'd, I don't ſee what reaſon you had peculiarly to brand him to poſterity as *an Incendiary*, when ſo many that were afterwards ſignificant in your own Church, at that time ran much greater lengths. I ſhould have thought he might have been forgiven, in conſideration of his preaching before the houſe of Commons, in favour of the reſtoration, the very day before it was voted that King *Charles* II. ſhould be invited home. You yourſelf own that his Majeſty "publickly acknowledg'd his aſſiſtance, and "made him his Chaplain in ordinary;" and you know he might have been a Biſhop too, had he been ſo inclin'd. I ſhould have tho't a ſofter word might have been to the full as proper in his caſe, who was more remarkable for nothing, than for his great love of peace and moderation.

Vol. III. p. 6.

Mr. *Stephen Marſhall* was another member of the Aſſembly: And of him you ſay, That (jointly with Dr. *Downing*) he publickly maintain'd, That the ſoldiers taken priſoners at *Brentford*, and diſcharg'd by the King, upon their oaths, that they would never more bear arms againſt him, were not oblig'd by that oath; but that he boldly abſolv'd them. Had this been true, it could not but have been publickly known; and as he had many enemies, that watch'd for his halting, could not have fail'd of being charg'd upon him. So that there is little likelyhood he could have kept up his reputation as he did to the laſt. Where you pick'd

Vol. II. p. 366.

pick'd it up I know not: But you muſt give me leave to queſtion the truth of it, till I ſee it well-atteſted. And then, as for his " de- Vol. II.
" parting the world mad and raving," ſup- p. 783.
poſing it true, I do'nt ſee what inference you can draw from it, without aſſerting that that never was the caſe of a man of unqueſtion'd piety, and probity, and worth, which would be a raſh and ungrounded aſſertion. However to me this ſeems likely to be a miſtake, by what I meet with in *The life and death of* Stephen Marſhall, *ſometime Miniſter of the Goſpel at* Finchingfield *in* Eſſex ; *written by way of letter to a Friend; and publiſh'd in* 1680. That villanous pamphlet was drawn up, I am inform'd, by his ſon-in-law, *W—*, who could not be ignorant of this, had it been true ; and who appears ſo bent upon defaming him, that it is not to be ſuppos'd that he omitted any thing that he knew could furniſh him with matter of reflection. He towards the cloſe of his account has this expreſſion : " Honeſt *Stephen*, for all his fame, wit, learn- " ing, honour, cunning, wealth, muſt die, " die of a conſumption too.— His ſickneſs " was long and tedious, which made him a " very skeleton, and ghaſtly ſpectacle before " his death. Some report that like *Hen-* " *derſon*, he dy'd full of horror and deſpair. " They that ſpeak moſt ſparingly of him, " ſay, he had not that aſſurance of his ſalva- " tion that he expected to have had at his " death." We may be aſſur'd that if this *rake-ſhame* could have found any reaſon to believe he dy'd *mad and raving*, he would not have ſpar'd him, or have forborn mentioning it. 'Tis hard to ſuppoſe that you ſhould have better intelligence as to his condition in his laſt hours, than He could get

who was ſo nearly related to him. This therefore I ſhould think you might very well have ſpar'd, without loſing any of the beauties of your work. And when you ſo freely repreſent him as one of the *trumpets of the times*, it might not have been amiſs, if you had a little conſider'd his defence of the ſide he took in our civil broyls; a piece which I am inform'd was never yet anſwered.

Vol. II. p. 156.

But there is one member of the aſſembly yet behind, on whom you are ſtill more ſevere, and that is Dr. *Cornelius Burges*, whom you call *a ſcandalous Doctor of divinity of the puritan party*: And tho' 'twould be no difficult thing to recriminate, and tell you of more than one ſcandalous Doctor of divinity of the high church party, yet if the account you give of him be true, I cannot think my doing ſo, would be any excuſe. You tell us, "he was the ring-leader of the rabble, that "appear'd tumultuouſly againſt the Lord "*Strafford*, and became famous in theſe ſort "of exploits, and was won't to cry out and "bragg, theſe are my band-dogs; I can ſet "them on, and take them off as I pleaſe." This I grant to be very unbecoming his function. You afterwards tell us he was "a *boutefeu*, and the perpetual trumpeter to "the worſt and moſt violent proceedings of "the Parliament: A great inſtrument in "bringing on the miſeries of the nation, in "which he was ſo furiouſly active, and with-"al ſo ſcandalouſly ſubſervient, that few or "none have undertaken to vindicate him." But I doubt not if a ſtrict ſearch were made, (which I am not now at leiſure for) there might be ſeveral found that were *boutefeus* on the other ſide, and as furiouſly active, and ſcandalouſly ſubſer-

Vol. II. p. 231.

Vol. III. pag. 154.

ſubſervient in bringing on the miſeries of the nation, by church rigour and ſtraining the prerogative, as ever he was by fomenting mobbs and clamours, among the populace, that yet have been vindicated and applauded. You add he was *a true time-ſerver*: But were all ſuch to have a mark ſet upon them, I'm afraid many that are mention'd with honour in your hiſtory, muſt be branded, "He gain'd ſo "much as to grow rich by the purchaſe of "Biſhop's lands: But after the reſtoration "he loſt all." And methinks that might be allowed to be a ſufficient puniſhment: "And "living privately at *Watford* in *Hertfordſhire*, "he there dy'd in great want and poverty, "tormented and eaten up with a cancer in "his neck and cheek; a fearful inſtance of "rebellion and ſacrilege. I find 'tis a common thing with you to ſet up for the interpreter of God's judgments, which you would in others repreſent as raſh and aſſuming. You diſcover this temper in my Lord *Ruſſel*'s caſe, and in Alderman *Corniſh*'s caſe, and in Mr. *John Hampden*'s caſe, as well as with reference to Dr. *Burgeſs*. Now ſuppoſe another ſhould take the ſame method with reſpect to Archbiſhop *Laud* and my Lord *Straford*, and ſome other applauded heroes of yours, would you not exclaim? And yet if you come to the reaſon of the thing, 'twould be hard to ſay why one ſide might not interpret the judgments of GOD in their own favour, and againſt their oppoſites, as well as the other. 'Tis a ſign this is not reckon'd a fair method, becauſe it would not be born, if retorted. To crown all, you add this admonition; "That an incendiary, let his *Religion* "*and cauſe* (and you may if you pleaſe al-"ſo add, *or dignity in Church or State*) be "what

Vol. III. pag. 164. Ib. p. 779. Vol. II. p. 414.

" what it will, is never to be ſpar'd by an " impartial hiſtorian; whoſe buſineſs is to " diſplay the honour, and expoſe the infa- " my of all that make a noiſe in the world:" And had you done this without diſtinction, I don't ſee how any could be juſtly aggriev'd: But under pretence of *never ſparing Incendiaries*, to charge men falſly with abominable crimes, and conceal whatever may be ſaid in their favour, is no great ſign of *impartiality*. That I may do a little Juſtice to the memory of this Dr. *Burgeſs*, I ſhall tranſcribe what I find concerning him, in a manuſcript hiſtory (which I have in my hands) of the aſſembly, drawn up by Dr. *Henry Sampſon*, a perſon well known in *London*. When he comes to this Doctor, he gives this account of him:

" A man of ſolid parts, and great learn- " ing. If any accuſe him for leaving the " epiſcopal ſide, (and then he was an ex- " cellent man) for covetouſneſs, or ſacri- " lege, he has anſwered for himſelf. If he " forſook epiſcopacy, in the time of his grea- " teſt ſtraits, he would not return to it, nor " make a ſordid recantation, that he might " be put into the Prieſts Office for a piece of " bread. Sure I am there is a ſermon of " his extant, which was preach'd at *Mer- " cers-Chappel*, Jan. 14. 1648, fuller of loy- " alty than the boldeſt of other men durſt " ſpeak at that time. Others made a baw- " ling in thoſe days and obſcur'd their " minds in ambiguities and metaphors, to " help them off if they were queſtion'd: " But he ſpake out. *Be wiſe now therefore O " ye Citizens, have no hand nor join with any " in ſuch a wicked act* (*viz.* of killing the " King:) And the reſt is in the ſame ſtrain.

" Its

" Its well known he argu'd againſt impoſing " the covenant in the aſſembly, and refus'd " the taking it till he was ſuſpended. If " any queſtion his abilities let them but read " his printed books, and they will ſoon be " ſatisfy'd what a ſolid Divine he was. He " was excellently skill'd in the liturgical " controverſies, and thoſe of Church govern- " ment. He was owner of all the books of " common-prayer that ever were printed in " *England*, and beſtow'd them upon *Oxford* " library. See his letter with them in A. " *a Wood*. How well he ſhew'd the neceſſi- " ty of reformation, his controverſy with " Dr. *Fearſon* declares. With him we may " match Dr. *Sparrow*, afterwards Biſhop of " *Exon* and *Norwich*, a great Liturgiſt."

And thus I have done with the members of the Aſſembly at *Weſtminſter*, and ſhall now paſs on to thoſe Miniſters that were ejected in 1662. There are ſome of them, of whom you give favourable characters: As of Mr. *George Hughes*, Mr. *John Tombes*, Mr. *Theophilus Gale*, Mr. *Matthew Pool*, Dr. *Wild*, Mr. *Charnock*, Mr. *Thomas Gouge*, Dr. *Owen*, and Dr. *Jacomb*. And there are a great many others of them that deſerv'd as good characters, as thoſe you have ſingled out: But as for others of them, you are ready enough to bear hard upon them.

Vol. III. p. 208. Ib. p. 408. Ib. p. 438. Ib. p. 568. Ib. p. 568. Ib. p. 608, 609. Ib. p. 647. Ib. p. 707. Ib. p. 841.

Sometimes you reflect upon a number of them at once: Thus you tell us, " That a " repreſentation diſclaiming all concern in " the endeavours us'd to promote the reſto- " ration, was in 1659, preſented to the " rump-parliament, by thirty-eight Mini- " ſters of the county of *Leiceſter*, of which " twenty-four loſt their benefices in the year " 1662." Which is what I have not had an oppor-

Vol. III. p. 850.

opportunity of enquiring into the truth of. But in the mean time, you take no notice how many of the epiſcopal clergy took the *Ingagement*, when others refus'd it: And that Dr. *Sanderſon* in particular wrote for the taking it, and pleaded for putting a favourable conſtruction upon it.

Nine Caſes p. 94.

AT other times you reflect upon particular perſons, and among the reſt on Mr. *Baxter*. You ſpeak with a great deal of contempt of his *Reformed Liturgy*. But give me leave to ask you, Whether you have ever read it? I therefore take the liberty to ask that queſtion, becauſe I can aſſure you, that ſome that have, and compar'd it with that eſtabliſh'd by law, do judge it for aptneſs and gravity of expreſſion, excellent coherence and method, and ſuitableneſs to all the emergencies of human life, to be incomparably the better.

Vol. III. pag. 48.

YOU tell us alſo of Mr. *Baxter*, "That "at the *Savoy* conference, he was either "perplex'd in his underſtanding, or indiſ- "pos'd for cloſing the difference: For no "propoſition could be made plain enough to "gain his aſſent: And it was hard to ſay, "whether his involving an argument, and "raiſing a miſt, was art or infirmity."

Vol. III. p. 49.

BUT I have given a ſufficient account of this matter in print already, and to that I refer you: And I cannot ſee how you can charge him with either being *perplex'd in his underſtanding, or indiſpos'd for cloſing the difference*, till you diſprove that general poſition he went upon, which I think may eaſily be defended; "That whenſoever the commanding or for- "bidding of a thing indifferent, is like to "occaſion more hurt than good, and this may

Abridgm. Vol. I. p. 168, 169, 170.

" may be foreſeen, there the commanding " or forbidding is a ſin."

You alſo add, " That he was much too " forward, and to blame in the manage- " ment of that conference, And that notwith- " ſtanding all his induſtry and activity, and " his no ſmall parts, he was inferiour in tem- " per, judgment and learning to ſeveral of " his brethren." But to this alſo, I have made a return already, when the ſame thing was objected by another author, from whom you thought fit to take it. All that knew Mr. *Baxter*, know he was of a warm temper: However, in the *Savoy Conference*, he did nothing but what his brethren preſs'd him to, and put him upon: And therefore I can't ſee how he can be blam'd for being *too forward*. 'Tis well you'll own him *a man of parts*; and you might, if you'd thought fit, have added, eminent piety too: And as for his being *inferiour to ſeveral of his brethren*, he was not backward to own it: And yet ſome of them, who had met with not a little applauſe in the world, did not think him at all their inferiour. But whatever he was, if compar'd with other Divines in the eſtabliſh'd church, or out of it, he was one that GOD own'd eminently in his work, and made uſe of to ſpread ſerious piety in a degenerate age, and therefore I think not to be ſpoken of with contempt, by any that have a love and value for real religion.

AND then, as to Dr. *Manton*, you ſay, " That " with all his good qualities and abilities, a " faithful hiſtorian ought not to let him paſs, " without declaring, that he knows not how " to excuſe his general proceedings in the late " times." I know not what you here refer to, except it be to the Doctor's praying publick- Vol. III. p. 438.

ly,

ly, at the time of *Oliver*'s inauguration in his Protectorſhip: And if I am there in the right, I deſire you to conſider why you ſhould give meaſures that you do not take; when you have no more ſignify'd your inability to excuſe Bp. *Sprat* for his famous Panegyrick upon *Oliver*, than I Dr. *Manton* for his praying at his inſtalment. You would be hard put to it to ſhew, that it is more unfaithful in me to let one paſs, than it is in you to take no notice of the other: When it is hardly ſuppoſable the Doctor's prayer, could have any thing in it more liable to objection, on the account of flattery, than the Biſhop's *Pindarick Ode on the happy Memory of* Oliver Cromwel *Protector*.

And when you add, "That tho' it cannot be deny'd, that the diſſenters felt a "great loſs in Dr. *Manton*'s death; yet the "church in general had not ſo great a "one in quitting his living, if it be conſi-"der'd who was his ſucceſſor, the unex-"ceptionable Dr. *Simon Patrick:*" One would hardly think that you were in earneſt, but that the matter you are upon is an unſeemly thing to jeſt in. Tho' Dr. *Patrick*, who ſucceeded Dr. *Manton*, was truly a great and a worthy man, and perhaps in ſome things his ſuperiour; yet does it not by any means follow from thence, either that the church in general had no loſs, becauſe that might have had the benefit of the publick labours of both Doctors, had the law allow'd it; Nor that every one that quitted his living in 1662, had as worthy a ſucceſſor as Dr. *Manton* had; nor that every one that ſucceeded in the room of thoſe ejected, were as unexceptionable as Dr. *Patrick*; nor that thoſe who kept in the church,

church, were generally ſpeaking to be preferr'd to thoſe that kept out of it: Nor in ſhort, that they that forc'd ſo many worthy men as were then ejected, to quit their livings for the ſake of their conſciences, did a thing that could be juſtify'd, or at all excus'd. And theſe things being barr'd againſt, tho' it ſhould be own'd that the loſs of the pariſh of *Covent-Garden* in Dr. *Manton's* quitting his living, was the leſs, in that he had ſo worthy a ſucceſſor as Dr. *Patrick*, I don't ſee what end it can ſerve: Nor can I perceive what you could aim at in mentioning it, unleſs it were to put a ſlight upon Dr. *Manton*, who was ſo worthy a man, that I think it not amiſs to ſay, I wiſh you and I may live in the world to as good purpoſe, and at laſt leave it with as much honour and credit as he did: And as I ſhould be ſatisfy'd with it, and thankful for it, ſo I ſhould think might you.

You have alſo ſome few other reflections that are pointed at me and my account of the ejected Miniſters; in which I took what care I could, tho' not ſo as to keep from miſtakes, which I am deſirous to have rectify'd.— You intimate, that Mr. *Jeanes* is not ſo properly to be reckon'd (as I have brought him in) among the ejected Miniſters. But when I my ſelf had taken notice of this, methinks you don't make any great diſcovery. Vol. III. p. 94.

You are afterwards pleas'd to flurt at me for ſpeaking of the humility and peaceableneſs of Dr. *William Spurſtow*, whom you call *a celebrated incendiary*. The proof you give of it is this: "That "he was one of the five, who compos'd the book "that ſo boldly ſtruck at the eſtabliſh'd religion, "call'd *Smectymnuus*, and that he preach'd certain "ſermons before the Long-parliament." But then you own, that he was ejected out of his maſterſhip of *Katherine* Hall in *Cambridge*, for refuſing the Ingagement: And this methinks is no great argument of his being an *incendiary!* For Vol. III. p. 154.

whatever concern he diſcover'd to have diſorders rectify'd, and grievances redreſs'd, he was for adhering to our old legal conſtitution. His being one of the authors of *Smectymnuus*, only ſhews that he neither thought religion to depend upon a ſtinted liturgy, nor upon dioceſan epiſcopacy: But notwithſtanding that work, he could have ſubmitted to a well regulated epiſcopacy, and a liturgy that ſhould have been freed from paſſages liable to juſt exceptions: And therefore I don't ſee why he mayn't ſtill paſs for an *humble and peaceable* Divine.

Vol. III. p. 49. You tell me, "That notwithſtanding my "plea, by the Common-prayer-book, the "Miniſter was never forc'd to adminiſter either "the Sacrament or the Abſolution to any per-"ſon unfit." Which is as much as to ſay, that you are for over-ruling my plea: But I conceive it might have contributed to the conviction of ſuch of your readers as are for ſeeing with their own eyes, if you had given the reaſon for your doing ſo; that ſo they might have been judges of the grounds you go upon. Your aſſerting ſo poſitively, while this is wav'd, looks as if you expected your affirmation was ſufficient to ſupply the place of proof; which is an allowance, I don't ſuppoſe you would make to another, and therefore I don't ſee how you can expect it ſhould be made to you, by any indifferent perſons.

I can't forbear adding one reflection more, which is this; that I neither admire many of the authors which you cite, nor your way of citing them: And I have ſome reaſon to think I am not ſingular in either. Many of the authors that are cited by you, have ſo little credit in the world, as to be far from giving ſufficient warrant to juſtify your inſerting things from them, into an hiſtory that ſhould give an account to poſterity of paſt tranſactions. And your way of citing 'em, is liable to very great objections.

You

You mention a number of names in your margin, at the beginning of a ſection: But as to the particulars produc'd, there's no diſtinction between what you had from one, and what from another. So that if your reader is deſirous to know your authority for any particular that occurs, he may ſtill be to ſeek for it, and not find it without a great deal of pains in ſearching. Nay, I cannot perceive there is any certain way of diſtinguiſhing what is purely your own, from what you produce authors for. This is a method that looks ſuſpicious: And tho' perhaps your taking it might be ſome eaſe to yourſelf, yet it naturally adds to the trouble of your readers, who many times muſt look into all your authors, before they can be fully ſatisfy'd where you had a paſſage which they enquire after, and whether your author is fairly cited, or miſrepreſented. You beſt know your deſign in this method which is peculiar to your ſelf: But I am very much miſtaken, if upon conſulting any number of your readers, you find it at all adds to the credit of your hiſtory, or renders it the more authentick.

And now upon the whole, I pretend not to judge how theſe my remarks on your performance, drawn up with ſo much freedom, will be reſented. It may perhaps diſpleaſe you, that I ſhould animadvert on what you call your *deep founded Fabrick*. But tho' you might build at your own pleaſure, you could expect no other than different cenſures from your readers; and if you are ſo diſpos'd, I don't ſee why you mayn't make uſe of 'em, in order to the building ſtrong as well as deep. You tell us you never was *deſtitute of honeſty and courage*. I am heartily glad to hear it, and wiſh the event may ſhew it: tho' perhaps you never yet had ſuch a trial in this reſpect as you'll have upon this occaſion. I can aſſure you I have not deſign'd *reproaching you*, (which you ſeem concern'd about) tho' I think I have

Pref. to Vol. II.

Ib. p. 6.

Ib. p. 8.

have discover'd good reason in several [illegible] differ from you. I can safely say, I have look'd a great many things that I think liable to just objection, that I might not be tedious: nor have I push'd things to extremity. Some I know very well, will think I have been too soft and tender: But I have taken the way in which I should best like to be dealt with my self in such a case. And if what I have offered in this mild way contributes nothing to your conviction, I am far from thinking hard words or severe reflections would have added either light or force to my Suggestions.

WHETHER you'll make me any return at all, or what shall be the way of replying, if you think some return not improper, I leave wholly to your self, without pretending to prescribe to you. Only if you should quote authorities upon me, I beg you'd be more particular than in your history, that I may not have an endless toil, in seeking for the passages referr'd to.

THE true reason of my preferring this publick way of the press to that of a private letter, was not that I had the least desire to expose you, but because I was willing those that come after us should be set right, in what I take to be of no small concern to 'em. And I can truly say, I have studiously wav'd any thing that I thought might be justly offensive: And notwithstanding all my freedom, can declare with great chearfulness, that all manner of prosperity, extensive usefulness, and success in all truly laudable designs, is more heartily wish'd you by no man, than by,

Westminster, *Octob.* the 20. 1718. the Day of the Coronation of King GEORGE.

Sir,

your sincere Friend,

and humble Servant,

E. CALAMY.

FINIS.

314159